DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 311 SP 034 699

AUTHOR	Raths, James
TITLE	NCATE Accreditation: A Framework for Preparing Section II of the Institutional Report. AACTE Accreditation Resource Series.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89333-106-6
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	111p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AACTE Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186 ($18 prepaid, for AACTE members; $21 prepaid, for nonmembers).
PUB TYPE	Guides - General (050) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Criteria; Educational Administration; Educational Practices; Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Evaluation; Governance; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Relevance (Education); Schools of Education; Student Needs; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS	*Knowledge Base for Teaching; *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

This monograph includes an analysis of current statements of standards and criteria, promotes professional dialogue concerning the meanings of NCATE standards and criteria, and advances the cause of national accreditation in teacher education. An introduction offers a statement of purposes, reviews the significance of the accreditation process, and presents caveats concerning the framework. Criteria for compliance subsumed by each standard are discussed separately with suggestions for gathering and summarizing evidence needed to prepare a narrative for the institutional report. The document is organized into five categories: (1) "Knowledge Bases for Professional Education" (design, delivery, content of the curriculum in general education, specialty studies, and professional studies); (2) "Relationship to the World of Practice," which focuses on clinical and field-based experiences and relationships with graduates and schools; (3) "Students" (admission, monitoring progress, advisory services, and completion of program); (4) "Faculty" (faculty qualifications and assignments, load, development, and evaluation); and (5) "Governance and Resources." Appendices provide models in teacher education and linkages found among preconditions, criteria, and standards. Tables of data or findings display evidence pertaining to the criteria. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 311

NCATE ACCREDITATION

A FRAMEWORK FOR PREPARING SECTION II OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

JAMES RATHS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Ewing

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AACTE
ACCREDITATION RESOURCE SERIES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP034697

NCATE ACCREDITATION

A FRAMEWORK FOR PREPARING SECTION II OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

JAMES RATHS

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle • Suite 610 • Washington, DC 20036-1186
202/293-2450 • FAX 202/457-8095

The standards cited in this document are taken directly from the following publication:

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1992). *Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units.* Washington, DC: Author.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The author was encouraged to express his judgment freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of

NCATE Accreditation: A Framework for Preparing Section II of the Institutional Report may be ordered from:
AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186

Single copy (prepaid) $18.00 for AACTE members, $21.00 for nonmembers

Copyright © 1993 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-106-6

recycled paper

CONTENTS

v	Tables
vii	Foreword
ix	Preface
1	Introduction
7	Category I: Knowledge Bases for Professional Education
9	Standard I.A: Design of Curriculum
15	Standard I.B: Delivery of the Curriculum
19	Standard I.C: Content of the Curriculum—General Education
22	Standard I.D: Content of the Curriculum—Specialty Studies
25	Standard I.E: Content of the Curriculum—Professional Studies
31	Category II: Relationship to the World of Practice
33	Standard II.A: Clinical and Field-Based Experiences
41	Standard II.B: Relationships with Graduates
43	Standard II.C: Relationships with Schools
45	Category III: Students
47	Standard III.A: Admission
50	Standard III.B: Monitoring Progress
52	Standard III.C: Advisory Services
54	Standard III.D: Completion of Program
57	Category IV: Faculty
59	Standard IV.A: Faculty Qualifications and Assignments
63	Standard IV.B: Faculty Load
65	Standard IV.C: Faculty Development
67	Standard IV.D: Faculty Evaluation
69	Category V: Governance and Resources
71	Standard V.A: Governance
76	Standard V.B: Resources
85	Appendices
87	Appendix A: Models in Teacher Education
103	Appendix B: Linkages Found Among Preconditions, Criteria, and Standards
107	About the Author

TABLES

6	Table 1:	Terms and Symbols Used in the Framework Document
10	Table 2:	Criterion 1 — Models Adopted by Programs in the Unit
11	Table 3:	Criterion 2 — Knowledge Bases for the Basic Programs
18	Table 4:	Standard I.B — Sources of Evaluation Knowledge
20	Table 5:	Criterion 10 — General Education Requirements Arrayed Against NCATE Rubrics
23	Table 6:	Criterion 13 — Analysis of the Specialty Studies Component
24	Table 7:	Criterion 14 — Guidelines Used in the Development of Programs
26	Table 8:	Criterion 17 — Profile of Experiences in Professional Education Sequence
27	Table 9:	Criterion 19 — Profile of Courses in Professional Education Sequence
34	Table 10:	Criterion 24 — Location of Pertinent Documentation Describing Placement Procedures
35	Table 11:	Criterion 26 — Focus of Supervisory Feedback in a Randomly Selected Sample of Comments
36	Table 12:	Criterion 27 — Placements of Education Students in Field-based and Clinical Experiences for Previous Academic Year
37	Table 13:	Criterion 28 — Scale of Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences
38	Table 14:	Criterion 29 — Length of Full-Day Student Teaching Experience by Program
39	Table 15:	Criterion 30 — Existence of a Charge Addressed to Three-Member Teams in the School Setting
40	Table 16:	Criterion 32 — Negotiated Agreements Governing Clinical Experiences

41 Table 17: Criterion 33 — Dates and Procedures of Follow-Up Studies for Programs

44 Table 18: Criterion 38 — Extent of Professional Faculty Engagement in the Professional World of Practice

50 Table 19: Criterion 44 — Monitoring of Candidates in Teacher Education

60 Table 20: Criterion 54 — Degree Status of Unit Faculty

79 Table 21: Criterion 83 — Allocation of Resources to Departments/Programs

81 Table 22: Criterion 86 — Description of Faculty Office Space

FOREWORD

David G. Imig
Chief Executive Officer, AACTE

AACTE is pleased to publish this volume as part of the Committee on Accreditation's Resource Series. Portions of this document have been utilized in the Association's professional development workshops, and many institutions have requested that the full document be made available more widely.

As with other publications in this series, Jim Raths' document is being offered as a stimulus to promote conversation among institutions about different approaches to interpreting and addressing NCATE standards. The Preface by AACTE President Mary Diez provides helpful guidance on how the document can be most useful, as well as modeling a starting place for such conversation within the individual institution.

This volume appears at a very opportune time. NCATE is currently conducting a process through which standards will be refined — that is, the original body of standards is being reorganized into a more cohesive and less redundant structure. As faculty in institutions previously reviewed under the Redesign seek to understand the new framework into which NCATE standards have been organized, Jim Raths' guidance can help realign the evidence presented for the initial review. For institutions seeking to document progress on standards found unmet or weaknesses identified in the initial review, this volume can be useful in presenting information on particular areas and in organizing data for trendline analyses. And for all institutions seeking to document program quality, this volume will help link the presentation and quality of data to qualitative dimensions of teacher preparation.

Finally, this publication can prove very useful within the proposed framework for continuing accreditation review. NCATE's continuing accreditation process will rely less on such documents as a comprehensive institutional report and more on data presented in the annual report, along with focused presentations of evidence developed by the unit for the interim visit. The recommendations presented here include specific advice on ensuring consistency between evidence presented in the Joint Data reports, preconditions documentation, and other unit reports. The approaches suggested in this volume can serve as a basis from which faculty

make decisions on how best to present the evidence needed for periodic reports and continuing accreditation visits.

We commend this volume to deans and faculty as a tool for developing information on the professional education unit that complements ongoing program improvement efforts.

Finally, it is with a sense of appreciation of the considerable work accomplished in producing a publication as complex as this one that I express thanks to AACTE staff members—in particular, Joy Brewster and Sharon Givens—for their tremendous effort to complete this publication. Final words of appreciation are due to the author for his patience with the publication process.

PREFACE

Mary Diez
President, AACTE, 1993-94

I received a call from a colleague in an institution in my state a while back. "Mary," he said, "we want to have you come and work with us to help us pass NCATE."

"No you don't," I replied, "you want me to help you to find ways to make your programs the best they can be."

Preparing for NCATE review requires taking at least two perspectives. The first—and in my view the most important—requires that one *capture the spirit* of the standards. Created in the NCATE Redesign process, the standards constitute a holistic framework guiding a school, college, or department of education (SCDE) to conceptualize what teachers need to know and be able to do and to design a coherent, quality program(s) to prepare teachers. The language of the standards is focused on the long term—asking how the unit *ensures* that the various components of the program fit together, how the unit collaborates in ongoing ways with other stakeholders (e.g., liberal arts colleagues, K-12 school personnel, etc.), how governance and the provision of resources *ensure* the fulfillment of the goals of the program—and how the unit has *built in* processes to ensure continuous improvement.

The NCATE standards, in calling for conceptually designed and collaboratively implemented teacher education programs, allow for a great degree of variation. Across all types of institutions, they call for a great deal of faculty discussion, argument, and collaboration in the ongoing design and implementation of programs. But, above all, their spirit is one of *invitation* to design effective programs rather than prescription regarding the "one correct way" to prepare teachers.

As the writer of the institutional report, however, one cannot help but take another perspective. NCATE will, after all, accredit an institution or not, based on the standards. So it is reasonable to be concerned about what will count as acceptable in relationship to each of the standards. Because NCATE is going to judge quality of the program, the "invitation" to design effective programs may not feel as open ended as I suggest above.

From the perspective of one who is preparing to address the 18 standards and their individual criteria, there may be a tendency to lose sight of the holistic effect of a set of standards. Each standard can become a documentation challenge, with the particulars of the program weighed against each criterion to see if the evidence is compelling. Not surprisingly, the "letter of the law" mentality can take over and eclipse, if not kill, the spirit.

There's a danger of falling into the trap of making the goal "passing NCATE," rather than seeing the goal as that which will be recognized by accreditation—creating a quality teacher education program. The SCDE *must* keep a dual perspective in its work to prepare for institutional review by NCATE.

A Guide to Using this Resource

We *need* the spirit at the heart of the NCATE Redesign to ensure the ongoing development of our programs. But we also need to learn to present the evidence about the design, the coherence, and the effectiveness of our programs so that others can judge its quality. That's where resources like the framework that Jim Raths presents in this document can be helpful.

To keep the balance of perspectives, however, as you use this resource, I suggest these cautions:

1. *Do not expect this document to do the work that your faculty have not done; if you do not do what the spirit of the standards requires, no amount of guidance on writing the institutional report can help you substitute for substance.*

   If you need help getting started on substance, look at Appendix A. It suggests a variety of approaches to conceptualizing the knowledge base. Be careful, however, to expand your thinking as well. Raths uses the term "selecting" a knowledge base. Institutions can also "create" or "develop" their own conceptualization. Another limit with appendix A is that the examples do not represent the breadth of institutional sizes and types. For liberal arts colleges, let me suggest exploring the conceptualizations of Alverno College (Milwaukee), Maryville College (St. Louis), and St. Mary's College (Notre Dame, IN).

2. *Do not expect this document to fit perfectly with your institutional context.*

   Because the standards can and will be met differently in institutions of different sizes, types, locations, and missions, one example may not fit all. Bear in mind throughout that there are many options for how to go about the documentation required by NCATE.

3. *Do not expect this document to provide a quick solution to serious issues.*

   Spend time thinking about how a standard fits with other standards and how the criteria might be *indicators* of the meaning of the standards. For example, while the standards call for collaborative work involving teacher educators and K-12 school personnel, each SCDE has to grapple with what is the best way to establish and maintain relationships. The kind of chart suggested for criterion #36 should be completed only *after* an institution has thought through the larger question of its goals in seeking and developing collaborative links with school personnel.

4. *Do not treat this document as prescriptive.*

   The author intends the examples as just that—*examples*. In many cases, Raths has given an example of a written policy as appropriate evidence for a criterion's being met. Especially in small institutions, there may not be the array of policy statements that may be appropriate in large institutions. Resist the urge to create policy for the sake of the report! Instead, find the evidence that will support your meeting the criterion, and remember that evidence can be qualitative as well as quantitative.

5. *Do not treat this document as a guarantee that you will succeed if you follow everything that it suggests.*

   Rather, treat this resource as *one view* and keep thinking and challenging what it says and the limits of its point of view. Return to the notion that success, ultimately, is in the quality of your program.

Along with the cautions—which I encourage you to return to whenever you feel the "letter of the law" becoming more important than the goal of improving your program—let me suggest ways that this document can be helpful as an SCDE prepares for the institutional report and visit by NCATE.

1. *Use this document as a resource in your planning.*

   Although I note above that you do not need to establish policies for every area Raths suggests, you may want to use some of his categories to create an order in the types of evidence that you will gather for your documentation.

2. *Use this document in conjunction with other sources.*

   Seek out articles and monographs that provide a variety of perspectives. Of special interest for those who want to keep the "spirit" of NCATE Redesign in mind, I'd recommend *Capturing the Vision:*

Reflections on NCATE's Redesign Five Years After (1993), written by Hendrik Gideonse and colleagues and published by AACTE. But there are also materials available from the AACTE Knowledge Base workshops and in back issues of the *Journal of Teacher Education* that will be helpful.

3. *Use this document to create conversation within the faculty.*

   In some cases you may disagree about what should count as evidence. Use the document to engage faculty in clarifying the spirit of the standard in question and in determining what aspects of your program fulfill it. The benefit may be not only in the writing of the report but in the refinement of practice.

4. *Use this document to stimulate thinking.*

   There are differences that affect how you will use this document, sometimes based on differences in epistemological perspective. For example, in Standard I.A, "essential knowledge" may be read in a holistic way, meaning that the institution thinks about what candidates for teaching need to know and be able to do. This is "knowing" in the sense of interacting with theories and information in a way that *makes knowledge.* When Raths talks about "bits of knowledge," it represents a different perspective on the knowledge base. Use this resource to help your faculty clarify how it thinks about these kinds of issues.

5. *Return to this document for its key messages.*

   Raths gives in many ways throughout the document the very simple, but critical advice: *Answer the question!* Be as direct and clear and simple as you can in laying out how your program fulfills the standards. Don't use obfuscation to cover up what you fear may be weak evidence.

   Raths also reminds the writer of the report to *be consistent*—both across sections in the institutional report and between the institutional report and the data available in the document room.

AACTE encourages others to follow the example of Jim Raths and to produce additional resources for institutions preparing for NCATE review. We need to reflect the experience of many types and sizes of institutions. We're grateful to Jim Raths for providing what we hope is one of many resources to be offered by AACTE that will help institutions use the NCATE process as a means to develop and document the quality of their teacher education programs. We commend him for his initiative and for his thoughtful presentation of ideas pertaining to NCATE accreditation. His efforts will produce a dialogue on the campus and among institutions that will be useful for all.

"There are more ways than one to skin a cat."

INTRODUCTION

This framework is offered to teacher education professionals engaged in preparing section II of an NCATE institutional report prior to a Board of Examiners (BOE) site visit. The introduction to the framework includes a statement of its purposes, a review of the significance of the accreditation process, caveats concerning the framework, and an overview of how the framework is organized.

It is widely held that the public relies on a "three-legged" stool of assurances to protect it from professional malpractice. First, most professions require that candidates for licenses graduate from nationally accredited programs in higher education. Second, candidates for professional status are expected to complete successfully a supervised "practice" experience. And third, candidates are expected to pass an appropriate examination. The teaching profession has been slow in getting this three-legged stool in place. Those who honor the NCATE process recognize it as a principal element in the professionalization of teaching. Writing an institutional report is a responsible and a highly professional activity. Those engaged in the process are dedicated to being forthright, honest, and open in sharing evidence with accreditation teams. This framework is written in part to help them with their tasks.

Purposes of the Framework

This framework addresses at least three goals:

1. To share an analysis of the current statements of standards and criteria in an effort to assist colleagues to address them completely and forthrightly in their institutional reports.

2. To promote professional dialogue concerning the meanings of the NCATE standards and criteria. As readers accept or take exception to the suggestions advanced, or spot short-comings in what they recommend, all concerned will be better prepared to improve language embodied in NCATE's standards and criteria.

3. To advance the cause of national accreditation in teacher education. As the process is improved and as greater consensus among all the stakeholders in the process is achieved, the credibility and the impact of NCATE will surely be enhanced.

Caveats for Using this Document

Persons using this framework should know its limitations.

1. The author's suggestions for preparing section II do not carry an NCATE imprimatur. The advice shared in his document is not official, nor is there any guarantee that an institutional report implementing this framework will lead to successful accreditation. The suggestions are solely a reflection of an analytic study of the language of the standards and their associated criteria for compliance.

2. The framework does not suggest how the institutional report (IR) should be written; nor does it recommend specific narratives to be included in the report. Instead, the framework suggests evidence to be collected, and in some cases made available to BOE members, so that an accurate and useful report can be written.

3. The spirit of the NCATE Redesign effort is to accredit the unit and not specific programs. Many of the criteria and standards include language such as: *"The unit will ensure that...certain conditions exist in the programs."* There are many ways that units can do this. This framework is limited to only the following two:

   a. It is assumed that some sort of policy document exists within the unit, asserting that compliance with conditions of a particular standard or criterion is an expectation of the unit. The existence of the policy is evidence that the unit is ensuring that the conditions enumerated in the criterion or standard are met. Whenever such a policy seems called for by the language of a criterion, a special notation *(p)* is entered into the framework next to the criterion number.

   b. It is assumed that an entity within the unit is responsible for monitoring the extent to which programs implement the policy. That is, an individual or group within the unit, such as the dean, the director of teacher education, the department chair(s), the unit curriculum committee, the program coordinators, and/or the director of student teaching, is assigned oversight responsibility. The oversight function should include collecting data, rendering a report, and similar activities that describe the degree to which the policy is implemented, and that offer recommendations for improving weak spots identified in the process.

The point is that there may be other ways in which a unit might "ensure" that programs comply with NCATE criteria.

4. The framework proposes creating tables to communicate the evidence relevant to a particular standard or criterion. The suggested headings for particular rows and columns may not fit all units or institutions: Alternate rows and columns should be considered before adopting those suggested in the framework. For purposes of illustration only, the suggested tables include two basic programs and one advanced program. Some institutions will have no advanced programs; others will have more than two basic programs and/or many advanced programs. Institutions will need to adapt the suggestions for table entries to fit their particular contexts.

5. A great deal of overlap occurs between the standards and the criteria; between the precondition statements and the standards and criteria; and between the annual reports filed with the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System and the elements of the institutional report. Appendix B of this framework attempts to identify where such overlaps occur. Institutions must review the author's judgments carefully. In some instances, the nuances of language of the elements that are identified as overlapping may suggest to them something quite different. Again, a claim that overlap occurs needs to be examined and judged anew *in each instance* and in the context of a particular unit.

6. Finally, the language and import of some of the criteria are almost impossible to document in the institutional report. The criteria give little direction for fashioning a response. They represent notions of curriculum, supervision, or evaluation that are, at best, difficult to discern and, at worst, almost impossible to document. There are at least three ways to respond to such criteria: (a) The authors of the institutional report can resort to "creative writing" that responds in general ways to the thrust of the criterion; (b) the authors can assert that documenting compliance with the criterion is difficult and, as a substitute, describe a plan or activity in which the BOE team members might become engaged to "see for themselves" the extent to which the unit complies with the criterion; or (c) the authors can simply concede that the criterion is not met.

Organization

The framework is organized as follows:

1. The criteria for compliance subsumed by each standard are discussed separately with suggestions for gathering and summarizing evidence needed to prepare the narrative for the institutional report. Each standard is reproduced at the beginning of a section, and the criteria, quoted beneath the standard, are interspersed with suggestions for evidence. It is assumed that once the evidence suggested by the framework is at hand, the actual writing of the narrative would be straight forward.

2. In some instances, the criteria for compliance subsumed by a particular standard do not appear to sum to the intents of the standard itself. In those instances, addressing the language of the criteria under the standard may be insufficient. When the language of a standard seems to extend beyond the scope of the particular criteria, additional recommendations for responding to the standard are included in the framework.

3. Where applicable, tables of data or findings are suggested for the display of evidence pertaining to the criteria. In some but not all instances, sample tables are suggested in the framework. In these model tables, it is assumed that there exist two basic programs (elementary and secondary) and one advanced program (school administration). Most units have more complex sets of programs in both the advanced and basic categories. All programs within the unit should be included in the table. The number of programs should match those identified in precondition 1.2. See caveat 4 above concerning the format for tables.

4. Where appropriate, suggestions for the documentation that should be available for review by the BOE are marked with an asterisk (*). These materials, and others specified by NCATE, should be accessible to BOE members in an exhibit room.[1] BOE members report that they find it extremely helpful if the location of documents cited in the institutional report is clearly entered in the narrative close to the citation itself.

5. AACTE members participate annually in the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System. The facts and figures submitted to this system should be in agreement with the corresponding figures entered into the institutional report. Criteria especially relevant to elements in the Joint Data Collection System are marked with a *(j)*. Appendix B summarizes the criteria that need to relate to the Joint Data Collection System.

6. For some criteria, the framework suggests that a content analysis procedure be applied to documents, records, or materials to summarize their complexity and to reduce the data so that they can be appropriately focused vis-a-vis the criterion. The framework does not describe in detail how the content analysis might be conducted. A number of approaches could be considered. Undertaking a content analysis in the context of this framework involves the following steps:

---

[1] National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1990). *Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units.* Washington, D.C.: Author. p. 38.

a. Identify a recording unit:[2] A content analysis generally "counts" the inclusion of a particular concept or entity. For example, a content analysis dealing with multicultural education could count the number of courses with that concept either in its title or in the catalog description to describe the extent to which multiculturalism is embedded in the curriculum of a particular program or unit. In this example, the concept *multicultural education* would be the recording unit.

b. Identify the enumeration unit: Once a recording unit is identified, a decision must be made about weighting the instances of that unit. Using the example above, the decisions about weighting suggest perhaps that required courses including the concept *multicultural education* in their titles or catalog descriptions should be given special attention; or that narratives that include the concept *multicultural education* in a single sentence should be differentiated from courses where the concept is a part of a list of many other similar concerns, such as: "This course deals with multicultural education, literacy, diversity in the classroom, and special education."

There are a number of standard references to content analysis approaches that could be studied before carrying out an analysis as outlined in the framework.[3]

7. Some criteria refer to basic programs only; others refer to advanced programs only. In the framework, suggestions for addressing criteria appropriate only for basic programs will be noted with a parenthetical comment, *(Basic only)*. Suggestions for responding to criteria appropriate *only* for advanced programs will be noted with a parenthetical comment, *(Advanced only)*.

8. The framework recommends making faculty and student records available to BOE members. Special sensitivity comes into play concerning the confidentiality of personnel records. It would make sense to clear the plans the unit adopts in this matter with the institution's attorneys to ensure that the plans are in compliance with federal and state laws and institutional practices.

---

[2] A recording unit is defined by Berelson (1952) as the "smallest body of content in which the appearance of a referent is counted." (p. 135). A recording unit could be a word, a paragraph, a sentence, or a page.

[3] Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.

Table 1:	Terms and Symbols Used in the Framework Document
p	This symbol indicates that a policy at the unit level is called for, a document indicating that the unit expects certain conditions, relevant to the particular criterion, to be maintained.
teacher education	The term *teacher* is used generically here as it is in most NCATE literature. It refers, according to context, to teachers, counsellors, administrators, and other educational personnel in schools.
unit	The concept *unit* is defined carefully in NCATE's *Standards, Procedures, and Policies* booklet (see page 66). To carry out its review of both basic and advanced programs, NCATE makes two judgments concerning each of the standards. One judgment concerns the unit's functioning vis-a-vis basic programs; the second judgment concerns the unit's functioning with advanced programs.
institution	*Institution* in this framework refers to the larger context in which the unit operates, e.g., the college or the university.
j	This symbol indicates that the facts and figures reported for a given criterion should be in agreement with corresponding figures and reports filed annually with the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System.
*	This symbol suggests that a particular document be included with all the other written documentation that is available to BOE members in the exhibit room at the time of the site visit. See page 38 of the NCATE *Standards, Procedures, and Policies* booklet for further details. BOE members have indicated that they find it very convenient if the Institutional Report identifies the location of a document whenever it is cited.

9. **Special notations, some of which are described above, are used in the framework to convey special needs. As a review, the terms and symbols and their associated meanings are described in table 1.**

JAMES RATHS
Newark, Delaware
October 1, 1991

CATEGORY I:

KNOWLEDGE BASES FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The framework does not suggest how the institutional report should be written. It does not recommend specific narratives to be included in the report. Instead, the framework does suggest what evidence should be collected, and in some cases made available to BOE members, so that an accurate and useful report can be written.

STANDARD I.A: Design of Curriculum

"The unit ensures that its professional education programs are based on essential knowledge, established and current research findings, and sound professional practice. Each program in the unit reflects a systematic design with an explicitly stated philosophy and objectives. Coherence exists between (1) courses and experiences and (2) purposes and outcomes."

Criterion 1. "The unit ensures that its professional education programs have adopted a model(s) that explicates the purposes, processes, outcomes, and evaluation of the program. The rationales for the model(s) and the knowledge bases that undergird them are clearly stated along with goals, philosophy, and objectives."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policy adopted by the unit's curriculum committee stating its expectations for program proposals. The policy might indicate the criteria applied by the committee as proposed courses and programs are reviewed that are relevant to program coherence, established and current research, and sound professional practice. In addition, the language of the policy could also require that each program adopt a model. A unit that does not have a curriculum committee may assign the function to review course and program proposals to an executive committee, a teacher education council, or perhaps the faculty acting as a committee of the whole.

B. A table with the programs in the unit entered into rows. The columns are headed "Programs" and "Model." (See table 2.) In the second column of the table, in each cell, a brief phrase describing the model the program has adopted should be entered. More elaborate descriptions of programs and their models are required in section III of the institutional report.

TABLE 2: Criterion 1—Models Adopted by Programs in the Unit

PROGRAMS[1]	MODEL ADOPTED BY THE PROGRAM
Basic Programs	
Elementary	(*) "Teaching as Decision Making" after McNergney et al.[2]
Secondary	(*) "Teaching for Understanding" after recommendations of the Holmes Group.
Advanced Programs	
School Administration	(*) Schools as a loosely coupled organization.

* Full descriptions of the models are available to the BOE team in the Exhibit Room.

[1] All programs within the unit would be included in the table. The number of programs would match those identified in precondition 1.2.

[2] McNergney, R., Lloyd, J., Mintz, S., & Moore, J. (1988). Training for pedagogical decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education* 39(5):37-43.

C. (*) A brief description of each program and its model should be included in section III of the institutional report. The description should include program goals, a statement of program philosophy and objectives. The philosophy statement might look like the "Teaching for Understanding" position paper adopted by the secondary education faculty at the University of Vermont. See appendix B. Programs that prepared portfolios for the precondition document should revise their submission based on feedback received from professional reviews. Other programs will have a similar sort of documentation.

Content analyses of the goal statements and the criteria provided in response to criterion 52 by each program and the model should be included in the table called for in paragraph B above.

For any given model, it may be assumed that certain concepts are especially salient. For example, in teaching for understanding, some of the important concepts would include: knowledge construction, debriefing, activities, dialogue, assessment of understanding, concept maps, relationships, and so forth. The set of criteria that specify acceptable levels of performance required by criterion 52 could be analyzed to describe the extent to which those criteria reflect the significant elements of the model. Are candidates assessed on their disposition to debrief pupils' activities? Do candidates themselves understand the model as it describes how pupils construct knowledge in the classroom? Such an analysis can

be performed for each program in terms of its model. The analysis itself can be included with the documents filed in the exhibit room. A summary of the analyses can be included in the institutional report.

Criterion 2. "The knowledge bases used in professional education are broad and include the traditional forms of scholarly inquiry as well as theory development related to professional practice."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A bibliography from each program relevant to the full rationale for the model of the program should be included. The bibliography could be as modest as that found in the paper "Teaching for Understanding," adopted by the secondary education faculty at the University of Vermont (see appendix B). If the bibliography includes a review of the literature, the principal elements published in the review should be typed out to complete the list.

B. Entries in each bibliography (see paragraph A above) should be classified into categories of scholarly inquiry such as qualitative, quantitative, analytic, and other, as demonstrated in table 3. Other categories may be more appropriate for some units. The goal is to demonstrate the breadth of the knowledge bases that undergird the unit's programs, and their incorporation of traditional forms of scholarly inquiry.

TABLE 3: Criterion 2—Knowledge Bases for the Basic Programs

PROGRAMS	FREQUENCY OF QUALITATIVE CITATIONS	FREQUENCY OF QUANTITATIVE CITATIONS	FREQUENCY OF ANALYTIC CITATIONS	FREQUENCY OF OTHER CITATIONS
Basic Programs				
Elementary Education				
Secondary Education				
Advanced Programs				
School Administration				

Criterion 3. "The unit ensures that coursework in general education, specialty studies, and professional studies complement one another."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: This criterion applies to advanced programs as well as basic programs. Policy statements addressed to both categories of programs should be consulted in responding to these criteria. Also, the intent of this standard is not clear. The meaning of "complement" is not spelled out in the glossary. Units may need to advance their own definition before writing to this criterion.)

A. (p / *) The unit policy on general education should be noted. The policy indicates how the plan for general education complements the other components within each program.

B. A table should be devised with the goals of general education entered in columns and the goals of particular programs (either from the specialty studies component or the professional studies component or both) entered into rows. Narrative could be addressed to the cells where the goals of each component are especially "complementary."

C. (*) Records of discussions between faculty in the education unit and arts and sciences should be included. The documents should indicate how the two components may complement one another.

Criterion 4: "The knowledge bases of the professional studies component(s) are reflected in curricular design and planning; course syllabi; instructional design, practice, and evaluation; students' work; use of major journals in the field by faculty and students; and faculty and students' (especially graduate students) participation in research and synthesis."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. A content analysis should be performed of each description of programs, prepared as suggested in paragraph A response to criterion 1 above, as well as course syllabi submitted for review. The analysis will link the assignments candidates are required to complete with the models reflected in the unit's response to criterion 1. Again, the analysis will need to be conducted on each program. The same words, terms, or concepts used in response to criterion 2 can be used again. This time, the number of mentions of the concepts found in course syllabi and in the evaluation instruments are entered into a table.

B. (*) A list should be included of all published and unpublished articles written by unit faculty and faculty/graduate-student teams and related to the program model and its knowledge base.

Criterion 5: "The faculty responsible for professional education collaborate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of curriculum for the unit's programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) Minutes of faculty meetings at the program level for the past several years should be included. The minutes and the agendas should be indexed to show when actions were taken on matters of design, delivery, and evaluation of curriculum.

B. (*) Minutes of the unit faculty meetings, indexed to demonstrate when faculty acted on matters of design, delivery, and evaluation of curriculum.

C. (*) Minutes of the unit curriculum committee or other body responsible for reviewing curriculum proposals, indexed to demonstrate when members acted on matters of design, delivery, and evaluation of curriculum.

D. (p / *) Charge to the unit curriculum committee or other body responsible for reviewing curriculum proposals in the unit's bylaws.

E. (*) A roster of all faculty who participated in the design, delivery, and evaluation of each of the programs. The roster indicates each faculty member's departmental affiliation.

Standard I.A. "Coherence exists between (1) courses and experiences and (2) purposes and outcomes."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: The last sentence in standard I.A seems broader than the criteria subsumed by it.)

A. (*) A table for each program, with program goals listed in rows and with courses and experiences listed in columns. Place an *x* in appropriate cells to show which courses/experiences address which program goals.

B. (*) A table with the programs within the unit entered into rows. The table has three columns. Column two is labeled "Philosophy" and column three is labeled "Objectives." A *yes* is entered into the appropriate cells to

indicate that the program has an explicitly stated philosophy and/or a set of objectives. A cell entry might also identify where the statements of philosophy and objectives are located—in the catalog? in brochures? elsewhere?

C. (*) A table for each program, with the exit criteria (competencies) for each program described in response to criterion 52 entered into columns and the goals of each program entered into rows. Mark an x in the appropriate cell where goals and criteria match.

STANDARD I.B: Delivery of the Curriculum

"The unit ensures that knowledge bases and best practice in professional education are reflected in the instruction offered. The instructional practices and evaluation are fully congruent with the current state of knowledge about curriculum design, instruction, and evaluation."

Criterion 6. "Instruction by faculty in the unit is congruent in content and process with best practice and current and established research."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: It is the intent of this criterion that the instruction offered by faculty should be consistent with the model that undergirds the program.)

A. Documentation could include case studies of several teachers within each program—describing approaches used and content taught, as they relate to research on teaching and to the program's model.

Criterion 7: "Faculty instruction in the unit provides students with systematically varied models of instruction."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: It seems unlikely that a unit assigns candidates to particular sections of courses to ensure that varied models of instruction are experienced. If this judgment is correct, responses to this criterion should simply say that the expectation of "being systematic" is not met. In addition, if the intent of criterion 6 is that instruction should be congruent with the model adopted by the program, it is difficult to see how complying with criterion 7 makes sense, i.e., offering candidates the opportunity to experience teaching that does not reflect the program model.)

A. The case studies compiled as a response to criterion 6 may be used as a display of the variety of teaching available to candidates.

Criterion 8. "The institution as a whole regards the unit as one where instructional practice is constantly superior."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: It is unlikely that a unit can present anything other than anecdotal evidence to demonstrate compliance with this criterion. The suggestion below describes an empirical approach to documenting compliance. What makes this criterion problematic is that evidently it is not sufficient simply to be excellent with regard to instruction; instead the unit must demonstrate that the "reputation" of its instructional practice is superior. The language of the criterion suggests that image is more important than reality and that judgments about teaching are norm referenced.)

A. In the institutional report, a series of interviews may enable the BOE to assess the extent to which the unit is in compliance with this criterion.

B. A questionnaire can be distributed to a random sample of the institutional community. The instrument would make use of the "Guess who?" format found in sociograms. The instrument would include two items: a "demonstration" item and a "real" item. The demonstration item might read: "Think of a person who drives a BMW car, works in the insurance business, is 60 years old, and belongs to the local Ritzy Country Club. Guess his/her political affiliation: Republican, Democrat, or Socialist?" The task here is to make the guess on an actuarial basis. Of course, it is possible for this person to be any one of the three choices, but what is he/she most likely to be? If the respondent answers "Republican," then he/she is ready for the real question. The real question asks: "Think of a person who teaches his/her students with skill and with profundity, who is admired by his/her students, and who includes the fruits of scholarship into his/her well-planned lessons. Is this professor in Engineering, Education, or Arts & Sciences?" Again, this professor might be any one of the three, but what is a best guess here? (If a majority of people "guess" the professor is in Education, then the unit has met criterion 8.)

C. Deans (or other administrators) who are in a position to know about the unit's institutional reputation can be invited to write a letter describing their perceptions. The request for letters could include a passage such as the following:

> One of the standards of our accrediting agency (NCATE) has to do with our unit's reputation on campus in regard to offering superior instruction to students. Would you be willing to provide a letter we could cite in our accreditation report describing your sense of our School's reputation on campus with respect to the quality of instruction we offer our students?

Criterion 9. "The unit maintains a rigorous, professional instructional quality control mechanism."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policy calling on the unit curriculum committee (or other entity) to evaluate instruction regularly.

B. (p / *) The unit's policy for handling complaints about poor teaching.

C. (p / *) Sections of the institution's *Bylaws* that call for evaluations of teaching and programs.

D. (p / * / *advanced only*) For advanced programs, the graduate school/college/department's policy concerning evaluation of instruction on a periodic basis. (Appropriate for the review of teaching within advanced programs in the unit.)

Standard I.B **Suggestions for Evidence:**

(Note: One facet of this standard is not accommodated by the suggestions cited above, namely that the instruction within the unit is not characterized simply by lecturers using a piece of chalk and a blackboard. Instead, candidates should have access to computers, videotapes, simulations, and other elements that comprise modern instructional practice. Another idea found in this standard not directly addressed by the criteria has to do with the quality of evaluations.)

A. (*) A table with courses entered into rows (and required courses marked with an asterisk [*]) and with various methods entered into the columns, viz., simulations, micro-teaching, video feedback, reciprocal teaching, cooperative learning, and so forth. Enter an x in the appropriate cells to indicate in which courses those methods are used.

B. (*) For each program, a table similar to that suggested above with courses entered into rows (and required courses marked with an asterisk [*]) and with various sources of evidence used in the evaluation of candidates entered into columns. Examples of row entries include observation of practice, written logs, objective examinations, oral examinations, or feedback from pupils taught by the teacher education candidate. Enter an x in the appropriate cells to indicate the extent to which best practices in educational evaluation are reflected in the instruction within the unit.

C. An outline summarizing all the principal evaluation efforts reflected in the unit. Under each heading, references that were consulted in planning the evaluation strategy should be cited. See table 4 as a model.

TABLE 4: Standard I.B—Sources of Evaluation Knowledge

EVALUATION EFFORT	RELEVANT REFERENCES*
Follow-up studies	Katz et al., 1981.
Evaluation of candidates	Andrews and Barnes, 1990.
Evaluation of programs	Galluzzo and Craig, 1990.

* Citations serve as an example of format. Full citations could be included elsewhere in the document.

STANDARD I.C: Content of the Curriculum—General Education

"[Basic program] The unit ensures that education students receive appropriate depth and breadth in an integrated course of study that is offered by faculty in the liberal arts and other general studies. [Advanced program] At the advanced level, education students should have a solid grounding in general education that will allow for concentration on professional and specialty studies."

Criterion 10: "The general education component is a well-planned sequence of courses and experiences that includes theoretical and practical knowledge gained from studies in communications, mathematics, science, history, philosophy, literature and the arts. (Note: This criterion applies to the basic level only.)"

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: Because this criterion applies only to the basic level, color coded pages in the institutional report or some kind of format device may signal the special emphasis of this narrative.)

A. (p / *) Policy for general education in the unit.

B. (*) Minutes of meetings in which faculty planned the general education component of programs.

C. (*) A table showing the requirements in general education, translated into courses and indicating that candidates must take advanced courses as well as introductory courses within their general education component. This table should indicate which of the courses fall into each of the NCATE rubrics, namely, communications, mathematics, science, history, philosophy, literature, and the arts. [Note that NCATE omitted social science from this list.] See table 5.

TABLE 5: Criterion 10—General Education Requirements Arrayed Against NCATE Rubrics

NCATE Rubrics for General Education	Requirements in the General College Curriculum by Major Headings (by semester credit hours)			
	Basic Skills	Perspectives	Free Electives	Physical Education
Communications				
Mathematics				
Science				
History				
Philosophy				
Literature				
Arts				

D. (*) A table showing the general education requirements of candidates in Education contrasted with those applying to students in the College of Liberal Arts.

Criterion 11. "Education students are guided in the selection of general education courses that will provide an intellectual foundation in liberal arts and general studies and that are appropriate to the background of individual students. [Note: This criterion applies to the basic level only.]"

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: Since this criterion applies only to the basic level, color code the pages of the institutional report or use some kind of format device to signal the special emphasis of this narrative.)

A. (*) Advisor's Handbooks.

B. (*) A description of the computer printout that monitors the progress of unit undergraduate students in meeting program requirements. (Some units may not have such a monitoring system.)

Criterion 12. "Faculty in the unit and faculty who teach in the general education component collaborate on program planning and evaluation of general education. [Note: This criterion applies to the basic level only.]"

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: Since this criterion applies only to the basic level, color code the pages of the institutional report or use some kind of format device to signal the special emphasis of this narrative.)

A. (p / *) Letter of appointment to members of the All-Campus Teacher Education Committee, giving the committee charge. (In some institutions, such a campuswide committee may not exist.)

B. (*) Minutes of the All-Campus Teacher Education Committee meetings. (Again, some units may not have such a committee.)

C. (*) Minutes of the Senate Committee on Curriculum with those sections dealing with education programs tabbed for easy reference. This suggestion is relevant for institutions in which proposals for course changes and program changes need to be approved by an all-campus governing body, such as a Faculty Senate.

D. (*) Roster of all faculty who collaborated in program planning and evaluation as applied to the general education component of the unit's programs. The roster should include the faculty members' departmental affiliations.

E. (p / *) Unit policy mandating that faculty in all programs collaborate and consult with faculty who teach in the general education component of the institution.

Standard I.C **Suggestions for Evidence:**

(Note: There are no criteria of compliance in this set that pertain to advanced programs. However, the last sentence of Standard I.C is directed to advanced programs.)

A. (p / * / *advanced only*) To address the standard, describe how advanced programs evaluate the general education backgrounds of applicants. Include a policy for declaring deficiencies, requiring the candidates to take undergraduate courses (for no graduate credit) to ready themselves for graduate study.

STANDARD I.D: Content of the Curriculum—Specialty Studies

"The unit ensures that education students attain a high level of academic competence and understanding in the areas in which they plan to teach or work."

(Note: NCATE makes use of the phrase "specialty studies" to refer to the academic major of candidates. For candidates who major in elementary education, NCATE admits there is not much of a distinction between "professional studies" and "specialty studies" (see NCATE's Standards, Procedures and Policies, *p. 67). If the unit requires an academic major or area of concentration for its elementary candidates, then the term "specialty studies" may apply to this academic requirement.)*

Criterion 13. "The specialty studies component is a well-planned sequence of courses and experiences that includes academic, methodological, and clinical knowledge necessary for professional competence in teaching or other professional education assignments."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A rationale (for each program) for the particular sequence of courses required of candidates in the specialty studies component.

B. (*) A table (for each program) with required courses in the specialty area entered into rows. Required courses are listed in the materials found in section III of the institutional report. The columns include the headings, academic knowledge, methodological knowledge, and clinical knowledge. An x is entered into the cells of the table to indicate the role each course plays in delivering the knowledge NCATE specifies in this criterion. Alternatively, instead of merely entering an x into a cell, estimates of the emphasis given to each category, e.g., academic, methodological, clinical, in each course could be given—either in terms of percents or in codes, such as H = high emphasis; M = middle emphasis; L = low emphasis. See table 6.

TABLE 6: Criterion 13—Analysis of the Specialty Studies Component

Required Courses in the Program's Specialty Component	Course Conveys Primarily Academic Knowledge	Course Conveys Primarily Methodological Knowledge	Course Conveys Primarily Clinical Knowledge
History of the United States	x		
African Studies: History of Africa	x		
Democracy and Its Critics	x		
American Government	x		
Women's Roles in U.S. History	x		
Geography of the United States	x		
Cultural Analysis of U.S. History	x		

Note: A table similar to table 6 is needed for each program within the unit. Here is an example of a problematic NCATE criterion. If the term *specialty study* refers to academic coursework, how likely is it that requirements in this area will convey methodological or clinical knowledge necessary for professional competence in teaching?

Criterion 14. "The guidelines and standards of professional learned societies are used in the development of an appropriate sequence of courses for each specialty area."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table with each program entered into rows is recommended. In the second column in the table, enter the professional learned society(ies) whose guidelines were used in developing the program. Each program that was submitted for the precondition stage will enter the association that reviewed its materials. See table 7 as a model.

TABLE 7: Criterion 14—Guidelines Used in the Development of Programs

PROGRAM	SOURCE OF GUIDELINES USED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM
Basic Programs	
Elementary	International Reading Association
Secondary	National Council for the Social Studies, National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Science Teachers Association
Advanced Programs	
School Administration	National Policy Board for Educational Administration.[1]

[1] This professional board is not currently associated with NCATE.

Criterion 15. "The specialty studies provide education students with a mastery of the structure, skills, concepts, ideas, values, facts, and methods of inquiry that constitute their fields of specialization."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table for each program with the required courses in the specialty areas entered in rows is recommended. The columns are headed structure, skills, concepts, ideas, values, facts, and methods of inquiry. An *x* is placed in the cells to indicate the focus of the various courses required in the specialty sequence.

Criterion 16. "Faculty in the professional education unit and faculty who teach the specialty studies from other academic units collaborate in program planning and evaluation of specialty studies."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit policy calling on faculty within the unit to collaborate with faculty teaching in the specialty studies.

B. (*) A roster of all faculty in the institution who have collaborated in program planning and evaluation of specialty studies requirements. The roster should identify departmental affiliations.

C. (*) Minutes of meetings where specialty studies were discussed and where decisions were made in a collaborative fashion.

STANDARD I.E: Content of the Curriculum—Professional Studies

"The unit ensures that the professional studies component(s) prepares education students to work effectively in their specific education roles."

Criterion 17. "The professional studies component(s) is a well-planned sequence of courses and experiences that includes knowledge about professional education and relates it to the realities of practice in schools and classrooms."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. For each program, a rationale for the particular sequence of courses in the professional studies component required of all candidates in the program.

B. (*) A table with all the required professional courses entered into rows. The columns would include the experiences offered by the courses—academic study, clinical observation, classroom observation, simulation, student teaching, etc. An x is entered into the cells of the table to indicate the experiences that are available to candidates in the unit. Table 8 offers an example. A table such as this would be required for each program in the unit, or if the professional sequences are identical for subsets of a program, this table could be prepared for particular subsets.

TABLE 8: Criterion 17—Profile of Experiences in Professional Education Sequence

Professional Courses Required in the Program	Academic Study	Clinical Observation	Classroom Observation	Simulations	Practice Teaching
Educational Foundations	X				
Learning in Schools	X	X	X	X	
Human Development	X	X	X		
General Methods of Teaching	X		X	X	
Special Methods of Teaching	X	X	X	X	
Pre-Student Teaching Practica			X		
Student Teaching					X

Criterion 18. "The unit ensures that each course and experience of the professional studies component(s) is built upon and reflects defensible knowledge bases."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. The unit's response to this criterion will overlap with its response to criterion 1 and criterion 4. The procedure established for the review of course proposals (or to the review of programs), cited in response to criterion 1, should reflect the sense of criterion 18. Also, the content analysis of course syllabi suggested under criterion 4 should meet the intents of criterion 18.

B. (*) It is also recommended that, for each program, a course by course listing of the readings assigned to students, by author and date, be included. These lists should indicate that the readings are current and reflect the current knowledge base.

Criterion 19. "The professional studies component(s) includes knowledge about the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education; theories of human development and learning; research- and experience-based principles of effective practice; impact of technology and societal changes on schools; evaluation, inquiry, and research; and educational policy."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table for each program with all the required professional courses entered into rows should be developed. The columns will include the headings: social foundations; historical foundations; philosophical foundations; theories of human development and learning; research- and experience-based principles of effective practice; impact of technology on schools; impact of societal changes on schools; evaluation, inquiry, research; and educational policy. Enter into each cell an x to indicate that the course deals with a particular topic. Alternatively, a code to describe the degree to which each course treats the mandated topics can be entered into the cells. The code might be something like: I = introduces topic; M = taught to mastery level; R = reviews topic; A = applies topic; etc. A table such as table 9 would be required for each program in the unit. If the professional sequences are identical for subsets of a program, this table could be prepared for particular subsets.

TABLE 9: Criterion 19—Profile of Courses in Professional Education Sequence

PROFESSIONAL COURSES REQUIRED IN THE PROGRAM	FOUNDATIONS: SOCIAL, HISTORICAL, & PHILOSOPHICAL	HUMAN DEVELOPMENT & LEARNING	EFFECTIVE PRACTICE	IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY	EVALUATION & RESEARCH
Educational Foundations	M			I	I
Learning in Schools		M	x	M	A
Human Development		M	I	I	A
General Methods of Teaching	R	A	M	A	A
Special Methods of Teaching		A	A	A	A
Pre-Student Teaching Practica	R	R	R	R	R
Student Teaching	M	M	M	M	M

Criterion 20. "Courses and experiences support the development of independent thinking, effective communications, the making of relevant judgments, professional collaboration, effective participation in the educational system, the discrimination of values in the educational arena, and professional ethics."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table for each program with all the required professional courses entered into rows should be constructed. The columns will include the headings: development of independent thinking, effective communications, making of relevant judgments, professional collaboration, effective participation in the educational system, the discrimination of values in the educational arena, and professional ethics. Enter an *x* into the appropriate cells to indicate which courses deal with which topics. Alternatively, a code to describe the degree to which each course treats the mandated topics can be entered into the cells. The code might be something like: I = introduces topic; M = taught at mastery level; R = reviews topic; A = applies topic; etc. (Use the structure of table 9 as a model.)

Criterion 21. "The professional studies component(s) for the preparation of teachers provides knowledge about and appropriate skills in learning theory, educational goals and objectives, cultural influences on learning, curriculum planning and design, instructional techniques, planning and management of instruction, design and use of evaluation and measurement methods, classroom and behavior management, instructional strategies for exceptionalities, classrooms and schools as social systems, school law, instructional technology, and collaborative and consultative skills. Courses and experiences ensure the development of classroom and time management, effective communication, knowledge of different learning styles, teaching strategies, and assessment techniques. [Note: This criterion applies to the basic level only.]"

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: Since this criterion applies only to the basic level, color code the pages of the institutional report or use some kind of format device to signal the special emphasis of this narrative.)

A. (* / *basic only*) For each program, a table with all the required professional courses entered into rows should be included. The columns include the headings cited in the narrative for criterion 21, e.g., learning theory, educational goals and objectives, cultural influences on learning, etc. Enter an *x* into the appropriate cells to indicate that a course deals with the topic. Alternatively, a code to describe the degree to which each course treats the mandated topics can be entered into the cells. The code might be something like: I = introduces topic; M = taught to the mastery level; R = reviews topic; A = applies topic; etc. (Use table 9 as a model.)

Criterion 22: "The unit provides for study and experiences that help education students understand and apply appropriate strategies for individual learning needs, especially for culturally diverse and exceptional populations."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy for ensuring that all candidates are prepared to work with diversity in a classroom.

B. (*) A description of a "classroom diversity" course required of all candidates in all programs. (Not all units will offer such a course.)

C. The unit should arrange for a series of interviews that provide an opportunity for candidates to share with BOE members the extent to which they are prepared to work with individual learning needs.

Criterion 23. "The curriculum for professional studies component(s) incorporates multicultural and global perspectives."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. Conduct a content analysis of all course syllabi, noting occasions when concepts related to multicultural education and global education are mentioned in either course goals, course assignments, and/or course evaluative criteria. A chart or table demonstrating the extent to which these concepts permeate the programs of the unit may be developed.

B. (p / *) The unit policies on multicultural and global education.

C. The unit should plan interviews on campus with faculty and candidates for BOE members so they might acquaint themselves with the global and multicultural perspectives that are embedded in the curriculum.

CATEGORY II:

RELATIONSHIP TO THE WORLD OF PRACTICE

The framework does not suggest how the institutional report should be written. It does not recommend specific narratives to be included in the report. Instead, the framework does suggest what evidence should be collected, and in some cases made available to BOE members, so that an accurate and useful report can be written.

STANDARD II.A: Clinical and Field-Based Experiences[1]

"The unit makes certain that clinical and field-based experiences in the professional education curriculum are designed to prepare students to work effectively in specific education roles."

Criterion 24. **"Field-based and clinical experiences are systematically selected to provide opportunities for education students to observe, plan, and practice in a variety of settings appropriate to the professional roles for which they are being prepared."**

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: The distinction between this criterion and criterion 31 is unclear. Criterion 24 may be giving focus to appropriate settings in the sense that elementary candidates are placed in elementary schools, secondary candidates in secondary schools, and so on. The thrust in Criteria 31 seems to be that the programs found in particular sites are not only appropriate from the point of view of grade level, but also in programmatic terms. The programs at the sites are consistent with the models adopted for the particular teacher education programs. Perhaps both criteria could be addressed with the same narrative.)

A. (p / *) Policy of the unit having to do with the placement of candidates in a *variety* of appropriate practicum sites.

B. (p / *) The policies of all the unit's programs having to do with placement of candidates. These may be found in student teaching handbooks or other sources.

C. (*) Description of the process by which a candidate is "paired" with a cooperating teacher. In the narrative, refer the BOE to pertinent documents about placement procedures so they might read materials about policies for particular programs. See table 10.

[1] The criteria for Standard II.A in NCATE's *Standards, Procedures, and Policies* booklet are obscure. It is difficult to differentiate between criteria, or to know precisely what aspect of the field-experience component each criterion is addressing. Attend carefully to the notes entered beneath the criterion that appear to be especially problematic.

TABLE 10: Criterion 24—Location of Pertinent Documentation Describing Placement Procedures

PROGRAMS	REFERENCES DESCRIBING PLACEMENT POLICIES	LOCATION OF REFERENCES
Basic Programs		
Elementary		
Secondary		
Advanced Programs		
School Administration		

Criterion 25. "Clinical and field-based experiences provide education students with the skills that allow them to diagnose and solve problems that involve the application of the principles and theories from the knowledge bases of the particular professional program."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: This criterion suggests that the content of courses taught on campus should link with the problems student teachers and interns face in the classroom. There may be other interpretations of this language.)

A. (*) Descriptions of how campus-based courses are linked to field experiences. For example, some courses have field components; other courses are coordinated with field courses, with joint registrations mandated.

B. A list in the narrative of typical problems that candidates address in clinical and field-based settings.

Criterion 26. "Field-based and clinical experiences are accompanied by professional supervision and feedback that include attention to instructional plans, characteristics of learners and instructional settings, structured observation of the experiences, and detailed debriefing relative to program goals."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: This criterion apparently speaks to the quality of training provided to university supervisors and cooperating teachers for supervising candidates.)

A. (p) Unit policy for preparing supervisors for their roles and for monitoring their performances.

B. (*) The handbooks and guides that describe to candidates what is to be expected in their field component coursework and that set down the current policies concerning supervision and feedback.

C. (*) Files of all feedback sheets actually given to student teachers in the previous semester.

D. (*) A collection of all student teaching rating forms and comment sheets used in the various programs.

E. (*) For each program, a content analysis performed on a representative sample of comments entered from evaluation forms of candidates who are performing in the field. Each sentence might be the recording unit. Categories should include the rubrics appearing in the criterion, i.e., instructional plans, characteristics of learners and instructional settings, and other salient comments.

F. (*) A collection of a random sample of feedback sheets shared with candidates in each of the programs under review. Content analyses of these sheets should demonstrate to what extent comments and feedback delivered to candidates focused on instructional plans, characteristics of learners and instructional settings. Results can be portrayed as exemplified by table 11.

TABLE 11: Criterion 26—Focus of Supervisory Feedback in a Randomly Selected Sample of Comments

PROGRAMS	COMMENTS FOCUSED ON PLANNING	COMMENTS FOCUSED ON CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS	COMMENTS FOCUSED ON INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS	TOTAL NUMBER OF COMMENTS
Basic Programs				
Elementary				
Secondary				
Advanced Programs				
School Administration				

Criterion 27. "Education students participate in field-based and/or clinical experiences with culturally diverse and exceptional populations."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table can be used with the rows referring to various programs and the columns being the "variety of settings," e.g., middle class, working class, multicultural settings. The column titles reflect the unit's context. The cells will indicate how many candidates were placed in the various settings. See table 12 as a model.

TABLE 12: Criterion 27—Placements of Education Students in Field-based and Clinical Experiences for Previous Academic Year

PROGRAMS	MIDDLE CLASS SETTINGS	WORKING CLASS SETTINGS	MULTICULTURAL SETTINGS	TOTAL PLACEMENTS
Basic Programs				
Elementary	8	3	19	30
Secondary	3	0	14	17
Advanced Programs				
School Administration	0	0	12	12

B. (*) A brief description of the diversity found at each of the sites used for clinical and field experiences for each program should also be prepared.

Criterion 28. "Field-based and clinical experiences are sequenced to enable education students to develop the skills that will enable them to assume full responsibility for classroom instruction or other professional roles in schools."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: This criterion strongly suggests that all programs have pre-student teaching clinical experiences for candidates.)

A. (*) Policies in the unit that mandate a sequence of field and clinical experiences prior to student teaching, specifically "early field experiences."

B. (*) A table depicting the nature of the policies related to paragraph A above. The policies for each program can be summarized in tabular form by entering appropriate responses in each cell. See table 13 as a model.

TABLE 13: Criterion 28—Scale of Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences

PROGRAMS	DOES THE PROGRAM REQUIRE PRE-STUDENT TEACHING FIELD EXPERIENCES?	HOW MANY DIFFERENT EXPERIENCES ARE REQUIRED AND (IN PAREN) HOW MANY HOURS (EST)?	SOURCE OF NARRATIVES WHICH DESCRIBE THE VARIOUS PRE-STUDENT TEACHING FIELD EXPERIENCES?
Basic Programs			
Elementary	Yes	3 (150)	Handbook, p. 22-75
Secondary	Yes	2 (100)	Handbook, p. 45-48
Advanced Programs			
School Administration	Yes	1 (40)	Policy Manual, p. 34

Criterion 29. "The student teaching experience is direct, substantial, and full-day for at least 10 weeks. [Note: This criterion applies to the basic level only.]"

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: Since this criterion applies only to the basic level, color code the pages of the institutional report or use some kind of format device to signal the special emphasis of this narrative.)

A. (p / *) The policy statement about the length of student teaching established by each department and by the unit. The narrative in the institutional report will summarize in a sentence or two what those policies call for in respect to the length of student teaching.

B. (*) A table summarizing the thrust of the policies collected in response to paragraph A above by entering *yes* or *no* in the appropriate cells. See table 14 as a model.

TABLE 14: Criterion 29—Length of Full-Day Student Teaching Experience by Program

PROGRAMS	DOES THE PROGRAM REQUIRE DIRECT, SUBSTANTIAL AND FULL-DAY STUDENT TEACHING?	DOES THE PROGRAM REQUIRE AT LEAST 10 WEEKS OF STUDENT TEACHING?	SOURCES TO DOCUMENT THAT THESE REQUIREMENTS ARE OPERATIVE?
Basic Programs			
Elementary	Yes	Yes	See Student Teaching Handbook, p. ___.
Secondary	Yes	Yes	See Catalog, p. ___.
Advanced Programs			
School Administration	Yes	Yes	See Policy Manual, p. ___.

Criterion 30. "Three-member teams of the college-based supervisor, field-based supervisor, and education student have a well-defined charge to support a successful experience as the education student assumes full-time responsibility in the school setting."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policy handbooks of each program, color tabbed to identify the definitions of roles of the three-member triads noted in this criterion.

B. A table summarizing the above policies concerning the charges describing the roles of the three-member teams by entering a *yes* or *no* in the appropriate cells. Enter the information in a table that will direct BOE members to the appropriate sources. See table 15 as a model.

TABLE 15: Criterion 30—Existence of a Charge Addressed to Three-Member Teams in the School Setting

PROGRAMS	IS THERE A NEGOTIATED WRITTEN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIT AND COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS?	IS THERE A WELL-DEFINED CHARGE ADDRESSED TO THREE-MEMBER TEAMS?	WHERE IS THE CHARGE STATEMENT LOCATED?
Basic Programs			
Elementary	Yes	Yes	Handbook, p. 22
Secondary	Yes	Yes	Handbook, p. 50
Advanced Programs			
School Administration	Yes	Yes	Policy Manual, p.121

Criterion 31. "Sites are carefully selected for all field experiences, including cooperating schools and other professional internship locations, so that students are provided experiences consistent with the goals of the unit's programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: The distinction between this criterion and criterion 24 is unclear. Criterion 24 may be giving focus to appropriate settings in the sense that elementary candidates are placed in elementary schools, secondary candidates in secondary schools, and so on. The thrust here seems to be that the programs found in particular sites are not only appropriate from the point of view of grade level, but also in programmatic terms. The programs at the sites are consistent with the models adopted for the particular teacher education programs. Perhaps both criteria could be addressed with the same narrative.)

Criterion 32. "The roles and responsibilities of education students, college-based supervisors and field-based supervisors who participate in field-based and clinical experiences are delineated in negotiated written agreements."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: The unit's response should link this criterion with criterion 30. Criterion 32 asks for evidence of a formal agreement and *a policy*

within the unit that formal agreements are required. Criterion 30 seems to ask for the substance of the agreements. Both criteria can be addressed in the same narrative, documenting that what is written as policy is incorporated in formal agreements signed by the partners in the teacher education enterprise.)

A. (p / *) The written agreements each program negotiates with field sites.

B. (p / *) The unit policy that specifies that each program will have a written agreement with each site.

C. (*) A table can be prepared to summarize the program-by-program status of negotiated agreements, entering a *yes* or *no* in the appropriate cells. See table 16 as a model.

TABLE 16: Criterion 32—Negotiated Agreements Governing Clinical Experiences

PROGRAMS	IS THERE A NEGOTIATED WRITTEN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIT AND COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS?	DO THE AGREEMENTS SPELL OUT THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRINCIPAL STAKEHOLDERS?	IS THERE A WELL-DEFINED CHARGE AVAILABLE TO UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS, FIELD-BASED SUPERVISORS, AND CANDIDATES CONCERNING CLINICAL EXPERIENCES?
Basic Programs			
Elementary	Yes	Yes	Yes
Secondary	Yes	Yes	Yes
Advanced Programs			
School Administration	Yes	Yes	Yes

STANDARD II.B: Relationships with Graduates

"The unit maintains relationships with graduates from its professional education programs that include follow-up studies and assistance to beginning professionals."

Criterion 33. **"The unit keeps abreast of emerging evaluation techniques and engages in regular and systematic evaluations, including follow-up studies, to determine the success and quality of graduates in the professional education roles for which they were prepared."**

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) An updated table that parallels the information reported in the preconditions report. The rows should include all the programs in the unit, and the columns should specify the date of the last follow-up study and the method used in the study. See table 17 as a model.

TABLE 17: Criterion 33—Dates and Procedures of Follow-Up Studies for Programs in the Unit

PROGRAMS	DATE OF LAST FOLLOW-UP STUDY	METHOD USED IN THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY
Basic Programs		
Elementary	Spring 1991	Telephone survey of a random sample of graduates. The 1991 survey focused on foundations courses.
Secondary	Fall 1991	A mailed questionnaire asking 75 critical questions about the program.
Advanced Programs		
School Administration	Spring 1992	Exit interview at graduation time of all graduates.

B. (*) The reports of follow-up studies of all the programs in the unit. The narrative should also acknowledge and perhaps footnote the unit's response to precondition 4.

C. (*) Minutes of department or program faculty meetings where plans for follow-up studies were discussed.

D. (p / *) The unit policy mandating that programs undertake follow-up studies.

Criterion 34. "The results of evaluation efforts, including follow-up studies of graduates, are used by the unit to modify and improve programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: In effect, criterion 33 asks: Does the unit do follow-up studies? Criterion 34 asks: Does the unit act upon the findings of the follow-up studies?)

A. (*) Minutes of faculty meetings at which programs were modified and improved as a result of evaluation efforts, including follow-up studies of graduates.

Criterion 35. "The unit has developed arrangements with school districts in the area to provide assistance to its graduates who are first-year teachers and/or who are beginning other professional education roles as an extension of their professional education program."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy for engaging its graduates in coaching during their first years of teaching.

B. (*) Reports of coaches describing their efforts for the previous year.

C. (*) Evaluations on the part of school administrators of the coaching effort in which unit faculty participated.

STANDARD II.C: Relationships with Schools

"The professional education unit maintains positive working relationships with schools to advance the goals of the profession and to promote the effective preparation of professional educators."

Criterion 36. "Positive working relationships with local schools are developed and maintained to improve the delivery of quality education in P-12 schools."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) Letters from superintendents relating the extent to which unit professors have been helpful to them during recent years in improving the delivery of quality education in the P-12 schools.

B. (*) A state map with markers identifying the locations of schools in which programs have placed student teachers, and/or where unit professors have conducted research projects, school development institutes, staff development projects, and similar activities.

C. (*) A table identifying the schools with which the unit has had relationships entered as rows. The columns would contain headings such as "research sites," "student teaching sites," "school development sites," and so forth. An *x* is entered into the appropriate cells to indicate the extent of the unit's involvement in public schools. A time period of 3 to 5 years, or some other useful period of time, could be used in classifying the data.

Criterion 37. "The unit and local schools cooperatively develop research questions and inquiry strategies to encourage the involvement of practicing professionals with professional education faculty to further develop and refine the professional knowledge bases."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A bibliography of collaborative research carried out by unit and K-12 faculty in the schools over the past several years.

B. (*) A collection of papers noted in the bibliography prepared as suggested in Paragraph A above.

Criterion 38. "Professional education faculty are regularly involved with the professional world of practice in preschool, elementary, and/or secondary schools."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j) This criterion could be addressed by a table with all faculty entered into rows, alphabetically by programs. The columns would include ways in which faculty are involved with the world of practice: supervision of interns, inservice education, research projects, etc. An x should be entered into the table to indicate which faculty are engaged in what sort of activity. See table 18 as a model. The data associated with this criterion should be consistent with findings entered into the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-11.

TABLE 18: Criterion 38—Extent of Professional Faculty Engagement in the Professional World of Practice

FACULTY	SUPERVISOR	INSERVICE EDUCATION	RESEARCH
Elementary Education			
Aaron	X		
Brown			X
Charles		X	
Dean	X		
Fox			X
Secondary Education			
Edwards		X	
George			X
Hands	X		
School Administration			
Ingels	X		
Jackson		X	
King	X		
Zipfel			X

CATEGORY III:

STUDENTS

The framework does not suggest how the institutional report should be written. It does not recommend specific narratives to be included in the report. Instead, the framework does suggest what evidence should be collected, and in some cases made available to BOE members, so that an accurate and useful report can be written.

STANDARD III.A: Admission

"The unit's admission procedures encourage the recruitment of quality candidates and those quality candidates represent a culturally diverse population."

Criterion 39. "Incentives and affirmative procedures are used to attract candidates with potential for professional success in schools."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy at the basic and advanced levels for recruiting high-quality candidates to the Education profession, including minorities. (Apparently, NCATE will not accept institutional policies or practices alone.) To meet this criterion, the unit should have a plan of its own or a plan that is integrally linked with the institutional plan.

B. (*) A listing of incentives available to students, the qualifications for each incentive program, and the number who have accepted them.

C. (*) A table showing the SAT scores, the high school rank in class, the college GPA's of candidates in each program, indicating that at least in the area of academics, the unit has recruited students with a potential for professional success.

Criterion 40. "Applicants from diverse economic, racial, and cultural backgrounds are recruited."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy for recruiting minorities. Again, it is insufficient for a unit to rely on the institutional policy; the unit should have a policy of its own.

B. (j) Two tables, one for advanced programs and another for basic programs. The responses should be separated by color coding (by page), or designating the different responses by some kind of format device. Each table should have rows showing "applicants," "accepted applicants," and "graduated students" over the past several years. The columns would include the protected minorities in the United States—women, African

Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics, and others. In each cell, the number of students should be entered, and in parenthesis the percentage the number represents of the entire student body. The data reported here should be in agreement with the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-5.

Criterion 41. "A comprehensive system, which includes more than one measure, is used to assess the personal characteristics, communications and basic skills proficiency of candidates preparing to teach. This system includes, but is not limited to, (a) standardized basic skills proficiency tests, (b) faculty recommendations, (c) biographical information, and (d) successful completion of prior college/university coursework with at least a 2.5 grade point average (GPA) on a 4-point scale. [Note: This paragraph of the criterion applies to the basic level only.]

"A comprehensive system exists to assess the personal characteristics and academic proficiency of candidates seeking admission to an advanced program. This system includes, but is not limited to, (a) an evaluation of academic proficiency (e.g., the MAT or GRE), (b) faculty recommendation, (c) record of competence and effectiveness in professional work, and (d) graduation from a regionally accredited college or university. [Note: This paragraph of the criterion applies to the advanced level only.]"

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: There are two parts to this criterion—one for basic programs and one for advanced programs. Responses should be separated by color coding the institutional report [by page], or by designating the responses by some kind of format device.)

A. (p / *) For basic programs, the policy the institution uses to admit students into the unit—including all forms the applicant fills out and a statement of policy at the institutional level of how the various measures are weighted and judged.

B. (*) A table showing the extent to which the average candidate in the cohort of each program meets the admissions criteria.

C. (p / *) For advanced programs, the policy used by the graduate college/ school and each of the unit's advanced programs for accepting applicants into programs.

D. (*) A chart showing critical events during the admission process along a time continuum.

Criterion 42. "Admission decisions are monitored to ensure that the published set of criteria delineating acceptable levels of performance for admission are applied."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policies that require some committee, administrator, or other group to monitor admissions.

B. (*) A statement from the institution's admissions office describing how it monitors its own decisions.

Criterion 43. "Policies allow for alternatives to the established admission procedure to encourage the participation of individuals from under-represented groups and other students as determined by the unit."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) Policies available for nontraditional students seeking admission. Also, unit policies for appealing admissions decisions. For example, students may be permitted to attend continuing education classes for a period and gain admission to the institution and to the unit's programs, either advanced or basic, through such a route.

B. (*) A table showing how many candidates were admitted to the various programs in the unit through alternative paths.

STANDARD III.B: Monitoring Progress

"The unit has systematic procedures for monitoring the progress of education students from admission through completion of their professional education programs."

Criterion 44. "Systematic procedures and timelines for assessing student progress must include, but need not be limited to, the following data sources: (a) GPA, (b) observations, (c) faculty recommendations, (d) demonstrated competence in academic and professional work (e.g., research or term papers), and (e) recommendations from the appropriate professionals in schools."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy directing programs to monitor candidates at various points in the program, and the timeline associated with the policy.

B. (j) A table showing the number of students in each program who were recommended for probation, to be dropped, or other actions. The programs within the unit will make up the rows of the table; the columns would include: Students Recommended for Probation; Students Recommended to be Dropped; Students Recommended for Other Actions; and the Total Number of Students in the Program. (Other headings may be more appropriate.) See table 19.

TABLE 19 Criterion 44—Monitoring of Candidates in Teacher Education

PROGRAMS	STUDENTS RECOMMENDED FOR PROBATION	STUDENTS RECOMMENDED TO BE DROPPED	STUDENTS RECOMMENDED FOR OTHER ACTIONS	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM
Basic Programs				
Elementary	8	4	0	200
Secondary	10	5	0	150
Advanced Programs				
School Administration	1	1	0	60

C. (*) A table with each program listed in rows and with the sources of evidence used to make decisions about the quality of candidates' work as they progress through the program entered in columns, viz., GPA, Observations, Faculty Recommendations, Demonstrated Competence, and others. An x is entered into the appropriate cells to indicate whether each particular data source is used in the evaluation process.

D. (p / *) Faculty review of the implementation of monitoring policies within the unit.

Criterion 45. "Consistent procedures and relevant criteria are used to determine eligibility for student teaching and other professional internships."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policies of each program for admitting candidates into student teaching.

B. (*) A table for each program such as the following: The table would have only one row—including data from the latest academic year. The example is for the academic year 1991-92. The columns will include: Number of Candidates Applying for Student Teaching, Fall 1991; Number of Candidates Accepted for Student Teaching, Fall 1991; Number of Candidates Applying for Student Teaching, Spring 1992; Number of Candidates Accepted for Student Teaching, Spring 1992.

Criterion 46. "Systematic approaches are used to assist education students who are making unsatisfactory progress in their programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A collection of brochures and literature describing the services available from the various "student help" offices on campus, e.g., the tutoring center, the Dean of Student's office, etc.

B. A table summarizing the actions taken by the unit (or one of its committees) indicating how many students over the past several years were referred to various institutional "student help" offices.

STANDARD III.C: Advisory Services

"The unit ensures that systematic academic and professional advising is available to all education students."

Criterion 47. "The unit's advisory system provides education students access to academic and professional assistance, including information about requirements needed to complete their professional education programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A list of "student help" offices and associated brochures.

B. (*) A description of the advisory system used to assist students in making professional decisions.

C. (*) A description of the computerized system that informs candidates (and their advisors) of the courses they have taken and have yet to take toward the degree. The description should include a copy of a printout and an explanation of notes and comments.

Criterion 48. "Education students have access to publications that describe program requirements and institutional policies, including clear statements of due process."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A collection of all publications sent to candidates by the institution and the unit, such as newsletters emanating from the Office of Student Services. The publications should be tabbed to indicate the location of information related to academic and professional assistance, as well as requirements and appeal processes. The tabs should be color coded.

Criterion 49. "Education students are made aware of the availability of social and psychological counseling services within the institution."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) Tabs should be inserted into various documents made available to students, identifying where they are notified of social and psychological counseling services.

STANDARD III.D: Completion of Program

"The unit ensures that the academic and professional competence of education students is assessed prior to granting recommendations for certification and/or graduation."

Criterion 50. "Prior to making recommendations for certification and/or graduation, education students must be proficient in communication skills and their teaching or specialty fields. Students also must be able to demonstrate skills for effective professional practice."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy statement that its candidates are required to meet specific standards of proficiency in communication, and meet specific criteria demonstrating proficiency in teaching prior to completion of the program.

B. (p / *) The unit's requirement that all programs assess candidates after student teaching/internship to see whether they are worthy of being recommended for licensure.

C. (*) A collection of letters from all program chairs/directors/coordinators written to the unit's licensure officer on behalf of the faculty recommending candidates for licensure.

Criterion 51. "Evaluation systems that assess the academic and professional competence of students include multiple sources of data (such as standardized tests, course grades, and performance in classroom or school settings)."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: The response here must be consistent with the unit's response to precondition 6.)

A. (*) A description of how each program assesses candidates to determine if they have met the specific standards of proficiency cited in response to criterion 52, below.

Criterion 52. "The application of a published set of criteria that specify acceptable levels of performance for exit from all professional education programs is monitored."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The "exit criteria" for each program.

B. (p / *) The unit's policies concerning the application of exit criteria to all candidates.

C. (*) A collection of minutes of the unit's faculty committee's deliberations concerning a review of the exit criteria applied in specific, individual cases. (The names of students found in the records should be deleted to protect confidentiality.)

CATEGORY IV:

FACULTY

The framework does not suggest how the institutional report should be written. It does not recommend specific narratives to be included in the report. Instead, the framework does suggest what evidence should be collected, and in some cases made available to BOE members, so that an accurate and useful report can be written.

STANDARD IV.A: Faculty Qualifications and Assignments

"The unit ensures that faculty in professional education are qualified to perform their assignments and also reflect cultural diversity."

Criterion 53. "The composition of the faculty represents cultural diversity."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j) A table showing the distribution of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty by gender and ethnic status. The data in this table should be consistent with those reported on the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-7.

Criterion 54. "Faculty have earned the terminal degree or have exceptional expertise in their fields to qualify them for their assignments in professional education programs. They have formal advanced study or demonstrated competence through independent scholarly activities in each field of specialization that they teach."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table with all faculty entered into rows by program. The columns will include the following: Teaching Field(s); Terminal Degree in Teaching Field(s): *yes* or *no*; Formal Advanced Study in Teaching Field(s): *yes* or *no*; Competence in Teaching Field(s) Through Independent Scholarly Activities: *yes* or *no*. See table 20 as a model. Presumably, compliance with criterion 54 is demonstrated if there is at least one *yes* in every row of the table. (Note: If a faculty member teaches in two or more fields, he/she should be entered into the table twice or more times, to indicate that he/she is qualified in all the teaching fields.)

TABLE 20: Criterion 54—Degree Status of Unit Faculty

FACULTY	TEACHING FIELD(S)	TERMINAL DEGREE IN TEACHING FIELD(S): YES OR NO	FORMAL ADVANCED STUDY IN TEACHING FIELD(S): YES OR NO	COMPETENCE IN TEACHING FIELD(S) THROUGH INDEPENDENT SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: YES OR NO
Aaron	Elem Ed	Y	Y	N
Brown	Sec Ed	Y	N	N
Charles	Ed Ad	Y	N	N
Dean	Computers	N	N	Y
Fox	Spec Ed	Y	Y	N
Edwards	Ed Psy	Y	Y	Y
George	Ed Found	Y	Y	N
Hands	Eng Ed	Y	Y	Y
Zipfel	Sci Ed	Y	Y	Y

Criterion 55. "Faculty view themselves as members of the training and research arms of the teaching profession."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. An interview schedule BOE members might use when they visit with faculty during the site visit. The interview schedule is designed to inform BOE members of the attitudes of faculty concerning their roles as the training (sic) and research arms of the teaching profession. In addition, BOE members should be encouraged to review the scholarly activities and the service efforts manifested by faculty as documented elsewhere in the institutional report.

B. (j / *) An explication of the data reported in the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-11.

Criterion 56. "Faculty with responsibility for supervision of school-based experiences have had training in supervision as well as professional experiences in the school setting in which that supervision takes place."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j / *) A table listing faculty who have had responsibility for the supervision of school-based experiences entered into the rows. The columns will include: Rank; Full-time/part-time status; Training in supervision: *yes* or *no*, if *yes*, date of most recent training; Professional experiences in school setting: *yes* or *no*, if *yes*, date of most recent professional experience. The meaning of the phrase *professional experience* is not defined. Most likely it means having worked in school settings in a position comparable to the ones being supervised. The data reported here should be consistent with those submitted in the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-10.

B. (*) Schedules and agendas of meetings where faculty were oriented to the goals and purposes of supervision within programs.

C. (p / *) Program expectations of unit supervisors, including the frequency of visits and the evaluation of supervisory practice.

Criterion 57. "Part-time faculty meet the requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policy for appointing part-time faculty, including procedures and process.

B. (*) Résumés of all part-time faculty for the past year.

C. A table listing all part-time faculty employed for the past year. The table will have the following columns: Rank; Teaching Area; Area of Highest Degree; and Years of Experience in Higher Education.

Criterion 58. "Graduate students who are assigned to instructional roles are qualified in terms of formal study, experience, and training."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) The résumés (or their equivalent, such as application forms) of all graduate assistants assigned to instructional roles in the past year.

B. A table listing in rows all graduate students assigned to instructional roles in the past year. The table should have the following columns: Teaching Area; Area of Highest Degree; Years of Experience in Public Schools.

Criterion 59. "Cooperating teachers and other field-based supervisors have a minimum of three years of experience in the areas they are supervising and are certified for the areas in which they are teaching or working."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policy for assigning candidates to cooperating teachers, including the criteria.

B. (*) A table listing in rows all cooperating teachers the unit used for the past year. The table will have the following columns: Three Years of Experience: *yes* or *no*; Certified in the Area in which They Teach: *yes* or *no*. Alternatively, phrases may be introduced into the cells of the table which describe the status of each teacher in the designated areas.

STANDARD IV.B: Faculty Load

"The unit ensures that policies allow for faculty opportunities in teaching, scholarship, and service."

Criterion 60. "Work load assignments accommodate faculty involvement in teaching, scholarship, and service, including curriculum development, institutional committee work, and other internal service responsibilities."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The policies for each program in the unit having to do with teaching loads and their equivalents. For instance, one program may equate five student teachers with one three-credit course, or serving as a program coordinator may equate with two three-credit courses.

B. (p / *) The unit policies indicating how faculty share in the planning process and in their own development plans.

C. (p / *) The unit's policies dealing with criteria for promotion tabbed to indicate quantitative standards (if any) for teaching, service, and research.

D. (j / *) An explication of the data reported to AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report pertaining to faculty loads, item B-9.

E. (*) A table listing faculty in rows, and the particular courses (with credit hours entered in parentheses) each taught in the past year.

Criterion 61. "[Basic programs] The teaching load of undergraduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of 12 semester/quarter hours; [advanced programs] the teaching load of graduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of nine semester/quarter hours."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: This response should be in two sections, one for basic programs and one for advanced programs. The pages of the institutional report should be color coded or some kind of format device should be used to show that the responses are separate.)

A. (p / *) For basic programs, a statement on the part of the unit specifying its policy with respect to course loads for undergraduate teaching or the relevant policies of each of the separate programs.

B. (p / *) For advanced programs, a policy from the graduate college/school regarding full loads for graduate teaching, or policy statements from the various departments sponsoring advanced programs.

C. (j / *) An explication of the data included on the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report pertaining to faculty loads, item B-9.

Criterion 62. "Faculty keep abreast of developing work and debates about research on teaching and professional education as well as recent scholarly work in the areas that they teach."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. A content analysis of faculty résumés, citing "mentions" in papers, books, professional talks of issues concerning developing professional issues, such as research on teaching, school reform, and teacher education over the past several years.

B. (j / *) An explication of the data reported to AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System pertaining to service and scholarship, item B-11.

STANDARD IV.C: Faculty Development

"A systematic, comprehensive plan for faculty development is used by the professional education unit to provide for faculty development."

Criterion 63. "Systematic and regular faculty development activities are provided for faculty, cooperating teachers, and others who may contribute to professional education programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's comprehensive plan for faculty development.

B. (*) A listing of all professional meetings, orientation sessions, symposia, lectures, brown-bag meetings, etc. that faculty and/or cooperating teachers could have attended in the unit during the past year.

C. (p / *) A copy of the institutional policy regarding sabbatical leaves, travel grants, seed-money grants, etc.

D. (*) A list of all faculty within the unit who have taken advantage of sabbatical leaves, travel grants, seed-money grants, etc. within the last several years.

Criterion 64. "Faculty are actively involved in professional associations, and provide education-related services, at the local, state, national, and/or international levels in their areas of expertise and assignment."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table with all the unit faculty entered into rows, with a blank row separating the faculty by program. The columns should include: Local Associations, *yes* or *no*; State Associations, *yes* or *no*; National Associations, *yes* or *no*. The intent here is that the *yes* entry would indicate a membership that is currently active. Instead of simply entering *yes* or *no* into the cells, the various roles played by particular faculty may be entered. For instance, officer, presenter, committee chair, etc.

B. (j / *) A table with all the unit faculty entered into the rows, with a blank row separating the faculty by program. The columns would include: Provide Education-Related Services at Local Level: *yes* or *no*; Provide Education-Related Services at the State Level: *yes* or *no*; Provide Educational-Related Services at the National Level: *yes* or *no*. The intent here is that the services were offered within the last several years. (See AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System, item B-11.) Also, the data reported here overlap with those cited in response to criterion 38.

STANDARD IV.D: Faculty Evaluation

"The unit implements a faculty evaluation system to improve faculty teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service."

Criterion 65. "Faculty are regularly evaluated in terms of their contributions to the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These evaluation data are used in determining salary, promotion, and tenure."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy dealing with promotion, reappointment, tenure, and merit pay.

B. (p / *) A collection of the written policies in each program describing the processes and the criteria used in making merit pay decisions.

C. (p / *) The policy for evaluating unit part-time faculty.

Criterion 66. "Competence in teaching is evaluated through direct measures of teaching effectiveness such as student evaluations."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) Policies in the unit and the various departments that describe how teaching is evaluated and how student ratings are collected and used.

Criterion 67. "Evaluations of faculty are systematically used to improve teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service within the unit."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. An interview schedule for BOE members to interview faculty, which will provide evidence pertinent to this criterion. Faculty should be prepared to relate to BOE members how the evaluation process works in the unit to improve teaching performance.

B. (*) Case descriptions of instances where evaluations of faculty led to improvements in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and/or service within the unit.

CATEGORY V:

GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

The framework does not suggest how the institutional report should be written. It does not recommend specific narratives to be included in the report. Instead, the framework does suggest what evidence should be collected, and in some cases made available to BOE members, so that an accurate and useful report can be written.

STANDARD V.A: Governance

"The governance system for the professional education unit ensures that all professional education programs are organized, unified, and coordinated to allow the fulfillment of its mission."

Criterion 68. "The goals of the professional education unit are congruent with the institution's mission."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: The unit's response to this criterion is linked with its response to precondition 1.4.)

A. (p / *) Goal statements of the institution, the unit, and the various programs or departments.

B. A table showing the interrelationships between the goals of the institution and the goals of the unit. If the institutional goals were entered into the columns and the unit goals were entered into rows, then an *x* is placed in cells where they are in congruence.

Criterion 69. "The unit effectively carries out its responsibility and discharges its authority in establishing and implementing appropriate policies for governance, programs, admission and retention of education students, and faculty selection and development in professional education."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy notebook.

B. (*) A notebook including minutes of all faculty meetings for the past several years. The minutes should be indexed and tabbed so that BOE members can find meetings where policy decisions were made in the areas identified in the criterion, e.g., programs, governance, admission and retention of candidates, faculty selection and development. The tabs could be color coded, e.g., red for programs, green for governance, yellow for admission, etc.

C. (p / *) A statement of current policy describing the commitment on the part of other administrators in the institution to consult with the unit concerning faculty appointments in the realm of teacher education.

D. A description of the governance system of the unit, with a section illustrating "how a bill becomes a law," e.g., how policies are developed, approved, and implemented.

E. A table of contents of the unit's policy file should be entered into a table format for inclusion in the institutional report, indicating the policies the unit has adopted in the domains described in criterion 69.

F. (*) A description (chart) of the unit's administrative structure.

G. (*) A description of the unit committee structure with the charges assigned to each principal committee in the unit.

Criterion 70. "The unit effectively carries out its responsibility and discharges its authority in making decisions affecting professional education programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policies for reviewing and approving new programs and courses and dropping existing courses and programs.

B. (*) A description of some of the actions taken by the unit to review and approve new courses or programs.

C. (p / *) A statement of current policy which directs teacher education programs outside the unit to use the unit's governance procedure when changes to the program are proposed, or when new faculty are to be appointed to responsibilities in teacher education.

Criterion 71. "The unit effectively carries out its responsibility and discharges its authority for identifying, developing, and using appropriate resources for professional education."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policies for proposing new positions, for appointing search committees, and for treating the recommendations of search committees.

B. (*) An account of the procedures used in the search processes of recent appointments to the faculty.

C. (*) A copy of the three most recent budget requests sent to the central administration.

D. (*) A copy of the minutes of the unit's budget committee meetings showing faculty involvement in the process. A unit may not have a budget committee, but some other instrumentality of the faculty, such as an executive committee, may serve a similar purpose.

E. (*) A summary of the latest institutional or unit survey of space and the survey's implications for unit programs.

Criterion 72. "The unit effectively carries out its responsibility and discharges its authority in developing and maintaining appropriate linkages with other units, operations, groups, and offices within the institution and with schools, organizations, companies, and agencies outside the institution."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A list of all groups (professional organizations, corporations, foundations, consortia, etc.) with which the unit has developed linkages. For each linkage, a brief paragraph could describe the nature of the relationship and its purposes.

B. (*) Letters from visible leaders in the state, e.g., the state superintendent of schools, corporation presidents, foundation directors, the president of the state NEA, leading superintendents, and others attesting to unit faculty's participation in the state through teaching, service, and research activities.

C. (*) An organizational chart of the institution. This response should relate to precondition 1.2.

D. (*) A description of relationships with other units within the institution depicted in the organizational chart.

E. (*) A concept map showing all the professional organizations in the state and how they interrelate with the unit's faculty.

Criterion 73. "The unit has, and regularly monitors, a long-range plan."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) The institution's long-range plan.

B. (*) Any products that have evolved from formal planning efforts on the part of the institution, e.g., committee reports, proposals, minority reports, etc.

C. (*) A description of the process for developing the long-range plan.

Criterion 74. "An officially designated professional educator administers the professional education unit."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) A letter from the institutional president stating that the principal officer of the unit (chair or dean) is the principal officer of teacher education in the institution. The response to this criterion should be linked to responses to precondition 2.

B. (*) The curriculum vita of the dean, chair, or director of the unit.

C. (*) The criteria used in the last search for a dean, chair, or director.

Criterion 75. "A systematic plan ensures the involvement of teachers, education students and other education professionals in the unit's policymaking and/or advisory bodies for the purpose of recommending requirements and objectives for professional education programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) A statement of unit's policy requiring programs within the unit to engage teachers and students in the unit's committee structures.

Criterion 76. "Policies in the unit guarantee due process to faculty and students."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) Student policy handbooks, student teaching handbooks, and so forth.

B. (p / *) Unit *Bylaws*.

C. (p / *) A unit policy file.

D. (p / *) Department/Program *Bylaws*.

E. (p / *) A description of the unit's policy for grievances.

F. (p / *) Institutional policies (and brochures) on sexual harassment, affirmative action, as explicated by the Office of Affirmative Action.

STANDARD V.B: Resources

"Resources are available in the areas of personnel, funding, physical facilities, library, equipment, materials and supplies that allow the professional education unit to fulfill its mission and offer quality programs."

Criterion 77. "[Basic programs] There are sufficient numbers of faculty, including cooperating teachers and other field-based supervisors, to support programs offered by the unit. [Advanced programs] Each advanced degree program leading to the doctorate has at least three full-time faculty who have earned the doctorate in the field of specialization for which the degree is offered."

Suggestions for Evidence:

(Note: This criterion should be addressed in two parts, separating basic and advanced programs. A different colored paper or some kind of format device should be used to distinguish the two responses.)

A. (* / ĵ / *basic only*) A table with the programs in rows; the columns will include the number of students, the number of student teachers, the number of faculty assigned to the program[1], the number of field-based supervisors employed, and the number of cooperating teachers engaged in the program. Ratios could be computed for each program in an additional column to demonstrate that criterion 79 is met. The data cited here should be in agreement with the findings submitted with the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-10.

B. (* / ĵ / *advanced only*) A table with the advanced *doctoral* programs identified in columns, with an additional column headed by EdD/PhD. Graduate faculty should be listed in rows. The full-time equivalent (FTE) that each faculty member committed to the program in the previous academic year should be entered into the cells. To meet the criterion, the sum of each column should be at least 3.0 FTE. In the column headed, EdD/PhD,

[1] Chairs have had difficulty with the task of designating which faculty are assigned to which program for "how much time." To help, we might specify a particular semester by asking, for example, "In the fall of 1990, how many FTE were devoted to the elementary program?"

enter a *yes* if the faculty member has the terminal degree in the field of specialization, and *no* if the faculty member does not.

Criterion 78. "There are sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff to support programs offered."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j) A table with all of the unit's departments/programs listed in the rows. The columns will include: Administrative (FTE); Clerical (FTE); Technical (FTE); Faculty (FTE); Students Taught (FTE), for the previous fiscal year. Data reported here should agree with those cited in Form B of the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data System report.

Criterion 79. "Instructional resources for supervision of practicum experiences do not exceed a ratio of 18 full-time equivalent students to one full-time equivalent faculty member."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j) A subset of the data in the table provided in the unit's response to criterion 77 speak to this criterion as well. The data cited here should agree with those reported in the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System report, item B-10.

B. (p / *) The policies of all the departments/programs within the unit having to do with assigning faculty to supervision.

Criterion 80. "Support for faculty development is at least at the level of other units in the institution."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) Faculty development policies from all the other entities in the institution that are somewhat comparable to the unit, e.g., other departments, other colleges, other schools, etc.

B. (p / *) Faculty development policies within the institution, including policies for sabbatical leave, travel grants, equipment grants, taking courses at the institution while on faculty appointment, and other relevant policy.

C. (*) A table indicating the funds allocated and/or spent on faculty development by comparable units within the institution.

D. (* / *advanced only*) A table prepared by the graduate college/school showing the distribution of travel grants and equipment grants across colleges within the institution for the past fiscal year. (Relevant only when the unit offers advanced programs.)

Criterion 81. "The use of part-time faculty and graduate students who teach in professional education programs is limited to prevent the fragmentation of instruction and the erosion of quality, and they are supervised by full-time faculty to ensure program integrity, quality, and continuity."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A table with the programs listed in rows; the columns include Full-Time Faculty FTE; Part-Time Faculty FTE; Graduate Assistants FTE; and Students Taught FTE. This table will demonstrate the extent to which the unit uses part-time faculty and graduate assistants to teach in its programs. The data cited here should agree with findings submitted on the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data System report, items B-7 and B-8.

Criterion 82. "The budget trends for the unit over the past five years and future planning indicate continued support for professional education programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j / *) A table, perhaps a histogram, showing the unit's budget over the past five years in constant dollars, using a fair year as the base year. The table should include a rationale for using the particular year as the base year.

B. (p / *) A blueprint of the institution's and/or the unit's planning procedures, goals, and deadlines.

Criterion 83. "The unit allocates its available resources to programs in a manner that allows each of them to meet its missions and needs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit policy for allocating its budget funds to departments or programs.

B. (*) A table with the departments/programs entered as rows and the columns including Faculty FTE, Students Taught FTE, Budget for the previous fiscal year. See table 21 as a model.

TABLE 21: Criterion 83—Allocation of Resources to Departments/Programs

Department or Program	Faculty FTE	Students Taught FTE	Clerical Staff	Budget for FY (Previous)
Basic Programs				
Elementary	12.0	240.0	3.0	$400,000
Secondary	4.0	80.0	1.0	$100,000
Advanced Programs				
School Administration	5.0	50.0	2.0	$100,000

C. (*) A table with the departments/programs entered as rows, and with the columns including the normal budget entries used at the institution, e.g., Travel, Communications, Equipment, etc. In each cell, the dollars allocated to the department/program should be entered.

D. (*) For units with departments or programs with specific budget allocations, a table with the departments or programs entered as rows. The columns would include the Students Taught FTE, Percent within the Unit Students Taught, and Percent of Unit Budget.

Criterion 84. "Financial support provided during the last five years has been adequate for books in education, periodicals listed in *Education Index*, films and filmstrips, computer hardware and software, and other similar resources."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j / *) A table showing the expenditures for education-related books, periodicals, films and film strips, and computer hardware purchased during the past five years. The table should include all the periodicals listed in *Education Index*, indicating which are in the collection and which (if any) are not. The findings cited here should agree with reports submitted to the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data System, item B-14.

B. (*) A table showing expenditures within the unit for computing services or computing equipment over the past several years.

Criterion 85. "Facilities are accessible to individuals with disabilities."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The institution policy concerning accessibility of buildings.

B. (*) A table with two columns, one labeled "Building" and the other labeled: "Accessible: *yes* or *no*." Entered in the rows should be the buildings in which teacher education candidates take courses or use facilities. In the appropriate cells, a *yes* or *no* should be entered, indicating whether the building is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Depending on the situation, it may be easier to simply report that buildings are accessible, or that buildings are accessible, except...and listing those that are not.

C. A plan for a walking tour that BOE members can take during their visit so they can observe firsthand the accessibility of the buildings in the institution. See criterion 87, paragraph B below.

Criterion 86. "For each professional education program offered, faculty have office space, instructional space, and other space necessary to carry out the unit's mission."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A description of the special instructional spaces available to unit faculty, e.g., the computer lab, the counseling lab, the campus school, the teaching techniques laboratory, the day-care center, and so forth. These descriptions also respond to criterion 88.

B. (*) A table, with faculty names entered into rows. The columns would include the square footage of office space available to each faculty member. See table 22. Where office space is shared, the number of persons assigned to share the office should be entered into the table. Other columns should include: Telephone (*yes/no*) and Computer (*yes/no*).

TABLE 22: Criterion 86—Descriptions of Faculty Office Space*

FACULTY	OFFICE SPACE (SQUARE FEET)	OFFICE SHARED: YES OR NO (IF YES, (N) IS THE NUMBER SHARING, INCLUDING THE NAMED FACULTY MEMBER)	PRIVATE TELEPHONE AVAILABLE	PERSONAL COMPUTER AVAILABLE
Elementary Education				
Aaron	81	N	Y	Y
Brown	81	N	Y	N
Charles	150	N	Y	N
Dean	120	Y (2)	N	N
Fox	81	N	Y	Y
Secondary Education				
Edwards	81	N	Y	Y
George	81	N	Y	N
Hands	140	Y (3)	N	N
Zipfel	200	Y (4)	Y	N

* This example is given for only two programs. It is assumed that all faculty members, full-time and part-time, are entered into the table's rows.

Criterion 87. "The facilities are well-maintained and functional."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A statement from the institution about how much money is spent on maintenance and upkeep of the facilities. The statement could include additional information, such as "how many people are employed," "the number of person hours per week spent on the tasks," and similar facts.

B. A plan for a walking tour for the BOE members during their visit. The tour should allow BOE members to see all the facilities used by unit faculty and students. As a result of the tour, BOE members should be sufficiently informed to make a judgment about this criterion. See criterion 85, paragraph C above.

Criterion 88. "Facilities accommodate technological needs in professional education."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) Descriptions of literature search resources in the library and in the curriculum laboratory/library; the computer laboratories available to either faculty or students; the TV studios; audio and video production facilities across campus available to teacher education faculty and students; and other similar locations of technology services to which teacher education faculty and students can avail themselves.

B. (*) A table with all the facilities cited in response to paragraph A entered in rows, and the days and hours the facilities are open to candidates entered into the table.

Criterion 89. "An institutional long-range plan for renovation/updating of physical facilities (i.e., additions and replacements) has been developed."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The institution's and/or unit's long-range plan for renovating and updating physical facilities.

Criterion 90. "Library holdings provide adequate scope, breadth, and currency to support the professional education programs."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (j / p / *) A table showing the institutional library's practice of purchasing new books in teacher education and related fields, as well as new periodicals, over the past several years. Printouts listing the library's subscriptions to journals in relevant disciplines may also be included.

Criterion 91. "Systematic reviews of library and media materials are conducted periodically and are used to make acquisition decisions."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (p / *) The unit's policy for involving faculty in decisions about library holdings.

B. (*) Minutes and correspondence associated with the work of the unit library committee. If the unit has no library committee, the functions may be assigned to another instrumentality within the unit.

C. (*) A printout of titles included in the film library and the media collection.

Criterion 92. "An identifiable and relevant media and materials collection is accessible to education students and faculty."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) The locations of the collections, the hours the collections are open, and the borrowing policies—all issues relevant to the "accessibility" concern found in this criterion.

Criterion 93. "Modern equipment is available to support administration, research, service, and instructional needs of the unit."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. (*) A description of the video equipment available to the counseling laboratory, the teaching skills laboratory, and similar sites.

Criterion 94. "Necessary supplies are provided to support faculty, students, staff, and administration in the operation and implementation of programs, policies, and procedures."

Suggestions for Evidence:

A. The unit's response to criterion 94 will overlap with its response to criterion 83.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:
MODELS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

APPENDIX B:
LINKAGES FOUND AMONG PRECONDITIONS, ANNUAL REPORTS TO AACTE/NCATE, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS

Appendix A Models in Teacher Education

James Raths

The "Models" Mandate

One of the goals we all share for our teacher education programs is that they are coherent.[1] In coherent programs, the purposes of the program and the criteria for evaluating candidates are solidly linked in the minds of faculty and students—and each course within the program contributes to these purposes in measured ways.[2]

One approach for establishing coherence in a program is adopting a model. It is the approach NCATE mandates.[3] In NCATE's view, a model serves at least two purposes:[4]

1. It defines the relevant "knowledge base" for a particular program. From the literature relevant to the fields of teaching and learning, a model circumscribes a set of readings, of understandings, and of accounts that is pertinent to the candidates and the faculty within a given program.

2. It also generally defines what the graduate of the program should "look like" upon graduation. What sort of teacher, counselor, superintendent are we working to develop? If we don't know, so says NCATE, then how can we pull together in ways that will optimize our efforts?

It is important to note that NCATE also expects that the ways in which candidates are taught are consistent with the model that guides their pro-

---

[1] One way to think of coherence is to contrast a collection of things with a set of things. If I had a set of encyclopedia, and one were missing, the set would be ruined. If I had a collection of books, and one were missing, I would still have a collection of books. Coherence is associated with having a set of purposes, goals, or outcomes that adds up to a comprehensive whole.

[2] Barnes, H. L. (1987). The conceptual basis for thematic teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(4), 13-18.

[3] The NCATE language reads as follows: "*Criteria 1.* The unit ensures that its professional education programs have adopted a model(s) that explicates the purposes, processes, outcomes, and evaluation of the program. The rationales for the model(s) and the knowledge bases that undergird them are clearly stated along with goals, philosophy, and objectives."

[4] It is so important that no single person or consultant be taken as an authority concerning what NCATE mandates. The language of the standards and the criteria is vague and almost purposely obscure. Faculty members must read the text and make judgments about the best interpretation for their unit.

grams. In NCATE parlance, this is the "clinical fidelity" standard. By the way, this idea can be misinterpreted. A model that specifies a method of working with candidates in teacher education does not suffice as a model in NCATE's rubric. All sorts of teachers can be trained using microteaching and other simulations, for instance. Again, designating a program as "competency based" begs the question. Competencies toward what end? The model must include an image of the goals of the program.

Examples of Models

What are some examples of models that are either extant, reflected in the history of teacher education, or that are being considered at some site? Here are a few examples—some more sketchy than others.

Teaching for Understanding

Borrowing one of the principal themes from the Holmes Group effort, the secondary education faculty at the University of Vermont recently adopted "teaching for understanding" as a model. It is explicated in the accompanying essay and the "observation" form attached. The observation scheme has not as yet been approved by the UVM faculty. This model suggests what sort of teacher Vermont is interested in graduating in its secondary programs and delimits the relevant literature.

Teaching as a 'Helping' Profession

This model was implemented at the University of Florida during the mid-1960s under the leadership of Professor Arthur Combs.[5] Combs objected to the competency-based approach because of its ready acceptance of the "industry" metaphor in education. He argued that if industries were organized to benefit the worker, then industry itself would reject "system" approaches. In his eyes, teaching is a "helping" profession. It is the client who knows what he is feeling, what he would like to know, what his goals are, and what meanings certain experiences provide for him. The client occupies the central position in the interaction between the helper and the client. The program not only taught these practices to candidates, but used them as the principal "method" of instruction.

Madeline Hunter's Model

Professor Hunter developed a specific model of teaching which included well-defined teaching steps. However, it was meant to be a flexible model. She often referred to as a "white sauce." What she meant by that was that teachers needed to adapt her model to particular circumstances—transforming it as appropriate to become a discovery lesson, a

---

[5] Blume, R. (1971). Humanizing teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 52*(7), 411-415.

review lesson, or a field trip lesson much as a chef will transform a white sauce to versions appropriate for fish, eggs or meat. The model deals with issues of motivation, transfer of learning, and assessment.

Teaching as Decisionmaking

This model is a reflection of Jackson's work entailing an ethnographic study of schools.[6] In that study, Jackson counted the number of decisions that teachers make every hour and every minute. Shavelson[7] wrote a theoretical piece that defines the literature associated with teacher decisionmaking. The University of Virginia[8] and the University of North Carolina at Wilmington are two sites that have adopted versions of the Shavelson model.

Teaching as Curriculum Modification

This model has been considered at the University of Illinois. The faculty assumed that a curriculum is adopted by a Board of Education as a matter of policy. Teachers do not have the right to subvert that policy. However, teachers must adapt the curriculum to match the needs, interests, and competencies of the pupils in their classes. This program taught teachers how to individualize instruction, how to diagnose and prescribe, how to evaluate—in effect how to make the general ideas of the curriculum qua policy succeed in specific situations.

Teaching for Diversity

This model is similar to the one preceding, but it takes a more comprehensive view of the differences found with a classroom. Instead of seeing diversity as a problem to be overcome, teachers in this model learn to prize diversity, to seek ways to enhance diversity, and to celebrate its richness within a classroom. This model was proposed at the University of Illinois for consideration by the elementary faculty. It was not implemented.

---

[6] Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

[7] Shavelson, R. J. (1973). What is *the* basic teaching skill? *Journal of Teacher Education, 14*, 144-151. See also, Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51*, 455-498.

[8] McNergney, R., Lloyd, J., Mintz, S., & Moore, J. (1988). Training for pedagogical decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(5), 37-43.

Reflective Practitioner Model

Schon has made this approach quite popular.[9] According to Feiman-Nemser,[10] the practitioner model highlights the artistry or tacit knowing-in-action that competent practitioners reveal in their work. The University of Arizona has implemented the reflective-practitioner model—strengthening the disposition of candidates to reflect on their actions and their decisions and to change their practices based on such deliberative processes.

Teacher as a Professional

Professions are noted for at least three characteristics. They share a knowledge base; they advocate for the poor, the weak, the disadvantaged; and they collaborate in their efforts with colleagues and with members of other professions. The programs at the University of Vermont adopted this "model" to guide its programs and to evaluate its students. The model was adopted by means of parliamentary procedures and there were a large number of resisting faculty. It was not given a fair test.

Teacher as Social Reformer

The elementary faculty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison have implemented this model under the leadership of Michael Apple, Ken Zeichner, and others. In the mid-thirties, Teachers College, Columbia University offered a program that reflected this critical orientation.[11] Candidates are encouraged to work in their schools for social justice.[12] They are encouraged to inquire into who benefits from having the schools as they now exist and to work toward making the schools better serve the clients of the school—namely, the children.

Issues Associated with Models: An Incomplete List[13]

1. What is a good way of selecting a model for a program?
2. Can a unit permit each of its programs to have its own model, or should the unit seek to have as few models as possible?

---

[9] Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

[10] Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook for Research on Teacher Education*, pp. 212-233. New York: Macmillan.

[11] New College. (1936). *Teachers College Record, 38*(1), 1-73.

[12] Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 23-48.

[13] Buchmann, M., & Floden, R. E. (1990). *Program coherence in teacher education: A view from the United States.* East Lansing: National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (Issue Paper 90-6).

3. To what extent are teachings and lessons and activities permitted that are not directly linked to the model? Could, for example, a lesson on classroom management be taught even when its precepts are not consistent with the extant model?
4. What makes one model more effective or more useful than another?
5. What if a professor within a program chooses not to teach in a way that is consistent with a model adopted by his/her colleagues?

Attachment: Teaching for Understanding

Teaching for Understanding

James Raths

> The deeper, generic task of education is teaching students how to make knowledge and meaning.
>
> —*Tomorrow's Schools* (1990, p.10).

In defining the architecture of professional development schools, the Holmes Group places "teaching for understanding" at the center of its blueprint. It is reasonable to ask: What is teaching for understanding? What does it look like? How can it be differentiated from teaching that does not give emphasis to the understanding? *Tomorrow's Schools* does not offer a precise formulation. This essay proposes tentative answers to these questions in an effort to stimulate continued thinking about teaching for understanding and to clarify the meanings this phrase conveys. However, the search for the meaning of the concept in effect models its essence. The formulations set down here are indeed ephemeral. Further, as *Tomorrow's Schools* implies, these particular ideas will take on import only as they are modified through discourse in specific learning communities.

There is a second reason for making an effort to develop a more specific definition for the concept *teaching for understanding*. While this phrase has become a slogan of sorts for those who would improve our schools, it is likely that most teachers believe that they are already doing teaching for understanding. Teachers who teach straight from textbooks, who lecture most of the time, who assess learning through short-answer quizzes, and who tend to ask questions of their students rather than encouraging students to ask questions of them are probably convinced they are enhancing their students' understandings. If improvement is to come, those teachers must recognize how new and apparently better conceptions of teaching for understanding can be recognized in the classroom.

This essay bears a heavy intellectual debt to the profound work of Professor R. S. Prawat of Michigan State University. I am also indebted to Professor Lee Goldsberry of the University of South Maine for his sound and sage comments on an earlier version of this essay. I further acknowledge the cogent suggestions generously shared by Professor Amy McAninch of Knox College.

What is teaching for understanding?

To answer this question, seven defining principles are advanced for consideration.

1. Teaching for understanding gives emphasis to the student's own sense of purpose (*Tomorrow's Schools*, 1990, p. 18).

Whatever is being taught must link to the questions, wonderments, concerns, and problems of students. Progressives would advocate that students should pursue their own interests in school and the teacher's role was essentially one of providing materials that would aid the pursuit of learning. On the other hand, teachers who have first made a commitment to specific pieces of content engage in strategies termed variously as "establishing set," "motivating students," and "setting purposes" to engage the minds of students. Neither approach is entirely satisfactory, but all of these efforts are designed to accommodate this first-defining principle of teaching for understanding.

In contradistinction to this principle of teaching for understanding is the practice of teaching what Whitehead termed "inert ideas" (1929, p. 13). Whitehead called on teachers to see to it that the student should understand how the ideas we elect to teach can be applied "here and now in the circumstances of his actual life" (p. 14). In sum, again and again, teachers learn that as curriculum topics and ideas are seen by students as useful, relevant, and edifying, the stage is set for serious work.

2. Teaching for understanding forges linkages between the content/topics/ideas students are studying and ideas, topics, or understandings they have previously learned or experienced.

According to Prawat (1989), a number of researchers reporting in the literature dealing with teaching for understanding stress the importance of linkage or connectedness. There are at least three techniques teachers use for increasing the likelihood that an idea or topic found in the curriculum will become more meaningful to students.

First, the teacher demonstrates how the content/ideas/topics can be used to solve current problems or illuminate current issues. In this approach, knowledge is viewed by the teacher and the students as a tool (The Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt University, 1990). "When people learn about a tool they learn what it is and when and how to use it" (p. 3). In effect this knowledge of when and how to use knowledge is an example of something "being understood." As Brownell and Sims (1946) put it: "When a geometry student sees the usefulness of the Pythagorean theorem for laying off the corners of a tennis court, we may be sure that he has some understanding of that theorem."

A second approach calls for linking the content/topic/idea with other content/topics/ideas previously taught or previously experienced or already found in the students' repertoire of learnings. In effect, the knowledge that under study in the lesson is perceived by the teacher and the students as a "case" of some larger idea or generalization. By perceiving the linkage between the specific learning and the larger more comprehensive case, the learning becomes meaningful. This approach is that described by Ausubel (1968) and his "subsumption theory of learning meaningful material." Thus, the U.S. Civil War can be presented as a topic of study which exemplifies all and any civil wars—past and future—and students could be prompted to gain an understanding of civil wars in general by studying the U.S. Civil War. In this approach, teachers make use of the specifics of the curriculum to teach to important generalizations and/or significant intellectual processes. This focus prevents students from becoming bogged down in trivial facts or the basics of a study. As the Holmes Group (*Tomorrow's Schools*, 1990, p. 14) report reminds us, "You don't get the basics without the advanced."

A third approach entails efforts on the teacher's part to help students see relationships among the content that is being taught and other ideas—those that are both more abstract and less abstract. Teachers assist students in making such linkages through the use of concrete models (Mayer, 1989), conceptual maps (Novak & Gowin, 1984), or other graphic organizers (Clarke, 1990).

The first two defining principles are related. The first principle suggests that the topics/ideas/content taught in schools should be potentially meaningful and significant to students. The second says that the topics/ideas/content selected for study can be made more meaningful if they are related to other topics/ideas/content included in the students' repertoire. As the Holmes Group report reminds us, "Teaching is not simply locating knowledge out there and trying to beam it into students' heads. It involves using students' ideas as a foundation to build on, taking what students already know and think as a point of departure for new learning" (*Tomorrow's Schools*, 1990, p. 18).

3. Teaching for understanding engages all students in discussion processes in a climate that respects differing views and perceptions.

Prawat (1989, p. 14) calls our attention to research evidence that suggests that "discourse or dialogue plays a vital role in promoting student understanding . . . ." Teachers interested in enhancing the understandings of their students encourage them to share their meanings acquired through personal experience and the common experience of the classroom lesson. In preparing a statement about teaching standards, the National Council

of Teachers of Mathematics vouches for the importance of dialogue as follows:

> Students must talk, with one another as well as in response to the teacher. When the teacher talks most, the flow of ideas and knowledge is primarily from teacher to student. When students make public conjectures and reason with others about mathematics, ideas and knowledge are developed collaboratively, revealing mathematics as constructed by human beings within an intellectual community. . . . The teacher's role is to initiate and orchestrate this kind of discourse and to use it skillfully to foster student learning. (Commission on Teaching Standards for School Mathematics, 1989).

This advice to mathematics teachers is presumably relevant to all teachers interested in teaching for understanding. And again, this prescription is not new. Brownell and Sims (1946, p. 35) told us that "meaningful verbalization facilitates the acquisition of understandings, aids in their retention, and thus makes them available for later use."

4. Teaching for understanding gives emphasis to uncovering the meanings students have attached to the content/ideas/topics that are taught in class or reflected in personal experiences.

"Students are inveterate constructors of meaning. They are going to make sense of the ideas and topics we teach one way or another" (*Tomorrow's Schools*, p. 13). Prawat (1989, p. 13) reminds us that "access to knowledge is thought to be fostered when students are made aware of what they know and do not know about a subject." Whenever a lesson is taught, teachers interested in teaching for understanding make efforts to discover the meanings students have attached to the topics under study.[2] They might use tests, homework assignments, recitations, classroom discussions, role playing, clarifying procedures, reciprocal teaching, or other approaches to accomplish this goal.[3] As students respond to these assignments/activities, teachers make an effort to apprehend any misunderstandings, distorted interpretations, or incomplete explanations that may be evident on students' part. Long ago, Brownell and Sims (1946, p. 41) helped us see that "understanding is inferred from what the pupil says and does and from what he does not say and do in situation confronting him." Next, teachers intervene at an appropriate time to help improve those understandings. The point here is not to have students acquire the same meanings or understandings held by the teacher. It

---

[2] Actually, seeking to understand the meanings students have attached to topics/content/ideas is an excellent way of accomplishing the goals included under defining principle one above.

[3] Efforts to "uncover" what has been learned by students is called "debriefing." See Boud, D., Keough, R., & Walker, D. (1985), and Raths, J. (1987).

would not be realistic, for instance, to expect a sixth grader to hold the same sophisticated understandings concerning the process of evolution held by a sixth-grade teacher who has taken two or three graduate-level courses in biology. Instead, the goal is to improve the understandings that students hold for the important and relevant content/ideas/topics found in the curriculum.

The previous two defining principles of teaching for understanding are also linked. Principle three dwells on the importance of discourse for providing students with the opportunity for creating understandings. Principle four calls on the teacher to be alert to the meanings that students have created as they are reflected in their discourse and in their responses to debriefing assignments.

5. Teaching for understanding gives emphasis to the idea that we all live in a world where knowledge and meanings change as well as remain the same by strengthening students' dispositions relevant to learning (*Tomorrow's Schools*, p. 15).

Prawat (1989, p. 3) suggests that an important ingredient in teaching for understanding is the strengthening of relevant dispositions that students bring to the learning task. To help in this arena, teachers will prompt students to apply selected general assumptions about knowledge in their intellectual work:

a. For a given set of observations, there are often at least several different explanations to account for them. Students acquire the disposition to seek out multiple explanations.

b. Within a set of different explanations for a given set of observations, some explanations are deemed better than others. By better, it is meant that some explanations are more testable, more credible, more aesthetic, more parsimonious, or more useful. Students acquire the habit of choosing among the available explanations by acknowledging that one (or several) are more satisfactory than others—and explaining the basis of their choices.

c. Almost every explanation that is current and widely accepted in our culture has replaced a previous explanation that in another time was found to be credible. Teachers prompt students to take on the habit of comparing the current explanations with the previous ones to understand why the previous ones were displaced.

d. For every given set of observations or findings, it is important to strengthen the disposition of students to ask: Where did the findings come from? On what are they based? This wont to ask about the source of assertions or claims of facts is at the very heart of what is

taken to be "knowledge," namely that claims for it should be justified. Knowledge is justified in part if the student has a good reason for believing it (Poundstone, 1988, p. 117).

6. Teaching for understanding demonstrates a valuing on the part of the teacher of the *intellectual* work in which students are engaged.

As students are engaged in conversation, experience, interpretation, criticism, engagement, and voice, the litany that according to the Holmes Group (*Tomorrow's Schools,1990*, 1989, p. 12) captures the spirit of teaching for understanding, teachers convey to them and to significant others that the work of the mind is very important. Teachers can do this by carefully studying students reports; sharing the ideas of students with parents, fellow teachers, and with other audiences within and without the school; and by praising efforts that students make in the pursuit of understanding.

7. Teaching for understanding assesses students' progress by evaluating the quality of the understandings that students have constructed and the strength of the dispositions toward learning they have acquired.

This defining principle is closely related to principle six above. Principle six suggests that teachers prize the intellectual work performed by students. One way in which teachers can do this is to base their formal grades and other evaluations on the quality of understandings that students have acquired and the dispositions toward learning they have taken on. If teachers were to assess students' work solely using tests and instruments that call for memorizing inert facts, then the process is seriously compromised. Assessment must match goals. If it does not, the goals are undercut. Students will learn to study for the tests rather than to attend to understanding the important content/ideas/topics engaged in the classroom.

The old familiar *Taxonomy* (Bloom, 1956) suggests three ways of both defining and assessing understandings. The first is assessing the ability of students to translate an idea "into other language, other terms, or into another form of communication" (p. 89). The second approach is evaluating the ways in which students interpret ideas by uncovering their thinking about "the relative importance of ideas, their interrelationships, and their relevance to generalizations implied or described in the original communication" (p. 90). The third approach, called by Bloom and his colleagues, "extrapolation," assesses the ability of students to "make estimates or predictions based on an understanding of trends, tendencies, or conditions . . . It may also involve the making of inferences with respect to implications, consequences, corollaries and effects . . . ." (p. 90). The handbook itself is

a marvelous source of ideas for assignments and test items that might be used to assess the understandings that students have acquired.[4]

Observing "teaching for understanding" in the classroom

The seven defining principles associated with this version of "teaching for understanding" are captured in an observation form attached to this paper as an appendix. In this form, certain contexts of teaching are described, such as "introducing a lesson" or "justifying content." Below each context are several responses a teacher might make. Some of those listed are consistent with the seven principles described in this paper. The form could be used by teachers "observing themselves" on video or audio tape; it could be used by teacher education candidates who are observing a videotape of a model teacher; or it could be used initially by graduate students seeking to get a better grasp of the concept "teaching for understanding" than the one reflected in this essay.

Caveats

The seven attributes of "teaching for understanding" advanced in this paper should be qualified by the considerations provided in part by the listing of the following caveats.

1. The Holmes Group put it well. "The idea here is not to make graduate students out of third graders, in some parody of the university based curriculum reforms of the mid 1960s." (*Tomorrow's Schools*, 1990, p. 15). All of the prescriptions implied in the previous seven defining principles need to be qualified by phrases such as "as is appropriate," "as time permits," "no more than once a week," and others that match the contexts in which teachers are teaching.

2. The principles themselves are based on current explanations of how students learn meaningful material in school. These principles are and should be the focus of inquiry to reassess their truth value and the boundaries of the conditions that make them useful and relevant.

3. The mandate to "teach for understanding" does not prescribe "what" is to be understood. This essay does not define what is worth understanding, or what understandings should be taught. As Brownell and Sims (1946) said: "The pupil must develop *worth-while* (my emphasis) understandings of the world in which we live as well as of the symbols associated with this world." The distinctions between worthwhile understandings and those not worthwhile are difficult to discern. This is a serious limitation of this essay.

---

[4] Another source of assessment ideas is: Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T., & G. F. Madaus. (1971).

Summary

This essay has attempted to stipulate a definition of what comprises "teaching for understanding." It is important for others to review what is set down here and to consider ways the definition could be improved. Once we have a definition about which we can agree, then efforts must be made to ascertain how prevalent these behaviors are in classrooms and to determine if teachers who exhibit the disposition to emit these behaviors are more likely to teach their students to improve their understandings than teachers who do not.

References

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives.* New York: Longmans, Green.

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T., & Madaus, G. F. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Boud, D., Keough, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning.* London: Kogan Page.

Brownell, W. A., & Sims, V. M. (1946). The nature of understanding. In Henry, N. B. (Ed.) *The measurement of understanding* (pp 27-43). Forty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clarke, J. H. (1990). *Patterns of thinking.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt University. (1990). Anchored instruction and its relationship to situated cognition. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2-10.

Commission on Teaching Standards for School Mathematics. (1989). *Professional standards for teaching mathematics* (Working Draft). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Mayer, R. E. (1989). Models for understanding. *Review of Educational Research, 59*(1), 43-64.

Novak, J. D., & Gowin, D. B. (1984). *Learning how to learn.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poundstone, W. (1988). *Labyrinths of reason.* New York: Anchor Press.

Prawat, R. S. (1989). Promoting access to knowledge, strategy, and disposition in students: A research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 59*(1), 1-41.

Raths, J. (1987). Enhancing understanding through debriefing. *Educational Leadership, 45*(2), 24-17.

Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. (1990). East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Tomorrow's teachers. (1986). East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The aims of education.* New York: Macmillan.

TEACHING FOR UNDERSTANDING

(Note: This checklist should be completed by an observer who is familiar with the teacher's approaches to teaching subject matter content to pupils. The focus of the instrument is narrow. There is no attempt here to describe classroom management skills, bulletin boards, or sensitivity on the teacher's part to the emotional needs of students. It is an attempt to describe the extent to which the teacher is promoting improved understandings on the part of students as represented in the essay of which it is a part.)

Directions: Seven classroom situations relevant to teaching content to students are briefly set out. Under each, check the descriptors that best describe the patterns this teacher demonstrates in the classroom.

A: Introducing a lesson to the class:

a. Begins with a problem generated by students.
b. Links the content to be taught to problems that students generate or which they potentially might meet.
c. Announces that the lesson is next in the syllabus or the textbook.
d. Simply begins the lesson without preliminaries.
e. Other: Describe the trend.

B: Justifying the content of the lesson to the class:

a. Does not justify the content.
b. Presents content as a "tool" to solve problems.
c. Presents content as a "case" or "example" of some larger principle or idea.
d. Links content to other ideas and learnings through concept maps, graphic organizers, or concrete models.
e. Other: Describe the trend.

C: Conducting discussions in class:

a. Encourages students to talk with each other as much as they talk with the teacher in class discussions.
b. Sees to it that students with differing views and perceptions are protected from disrespectful reactions on the part of peers.
c. Gives students little opportunity to talk in the class except to respond to the teacher's questions.
d. Steers discussion toward understandings rather than simply recall.
e. Other: Describe the trend.

D: Becoming informed about the students' understandings:

a. Does not seem interested in acquiring information about the understandings the students are creating in the class.
b. Uses a variety of debriefing approaches to plumb the understandings acquired by students.

c. Uses the debriefing activity as an opportunity to reteach students so that their understandings become improved.
d. Other: Describe the trend.

E: Commenting upon the character of the students' work:

a. Praises explicitly the *intellectual* efforts of students.
b. Praises efforts whether they are intellectual or simply organizational or procedural.
c. Does not characterize the work of students to others.
d. Shares the fruits of students' intellectual efforts with other audiences.
e. Other: Describe the trend.

F: Assessing the understandings students have acquired:

a. Uses procedures that are appropriate for the assessment of understandings.
b. Uses short-answer tests and other approaches that are more apt for assessing the attainment of facts and separate pieces of knowledge.
c. Gives feedback to students about the quality of their understandings of the ideas covered in class.
d. Other: Describe the trend.

G: Strengthening relevant dispositions on the part of students:

DISPOSITIONS RELEVANT FOR TEACHING FOR UNDERSTANDING	TEACHER MODELS THE DISPOSITION IN CLASS. (ENTER AN *X* IF TEACHER IS SO DISPOSED.)	TEACHER CALLS ATTENTION TO STUDENTS' MANIFESTATION OF THE DISPOSITION. (ENTER AN *X* IF THE TEACHER IS SO DISPOSED.)
The disposition to seek alternative explanations.		
The disposition to sort through alternative explanations to identify the better ones.		
The disposition to identify explanations that were previously held.		
The disposition to ask for the sources of knowledge.		

Appendix B Linkages Found Among Preconditions, Annual Reports to AACTE/NCATE, Criteria, and Standards

I. Linkages Found Among Preconditions, Criteria, and Standards

A number of criteria, standards, and preconditions seem to be inextricably connected conceptually as well as substantively. Teacher educators who are preparing an NCATE institutional report might write to these linked elements in a number of different ways:

a. They might cite responses to earlier criteria in responding to later, related criteria.

b. They might simply check to see that responses to linked criteria, preconditions, and standards are consistent.

c. They might respond to the linked elements in a single narrative and invite members of the BOE to refer to the pooled essay when making judgments about one of the criteria found in the set.

This accounting serves to highlight briefly the essence of relationships among certain standards, criteria, and preconditions. The linkages proposed here may not reflect either the ways that a particular faculty interprets the language of the NCATE standards or the contexts of a particular institution. In short, the proposed linkages may exist for some units, but not for others. Further, the listing may be incomplete; other links may exist.

Criteria	Essence of Proposed Linkage
1. Precondition 1.2, Criteria 1 and 52.	Explicit descriptions of the purposes and outcomes of each program. Precondition 1.2 includes a listing of all programs in the unit. The descriptions of program goals and models asked for by criterion 1 and criterion 52 must include all the programs listed in response to precondition 1.2.
2. Criteria 1, 4, and 18.	Well-defined knowledge bases associated with every program.

3. Criteria 3, 10, 13, and 17.	Planning policies and practices leading to a cohesive program including the three components of programs—general education, specialty studies, and professional education.
4. Criteria 5, 12, 16, and 75.	Policies and practices concerning faculty collaboration in planning and evaluating general education, professional education, and specialty studies.
5. Criteria 6, 33, 62, and 66.	This cluster addresses the "clinical fidelity" issue. Do we do as well as we know? Further, do the faculty within the unit keep current in what is "best practice" and is this knowledge reflected in their teaching?
6. Precondition 4, Criteria 9, 33, 44, and 45.	Evaluation of candidates as they progress in unit programs.
7. Criteria 9, 33, 65, 66, and 67.	Evaluation of faculty.
8. Precondition 4, Criteria 9, 33, and 34.	Evaluation of programs.
9. Precondition 6, Criteria 9, 28, 33, 50, 51, and 52.	Evaluation of candidates at the completion of their programs.
10. Precondition 8 and Criterion 14.	To meet precondition 8, portfolios were submitted to "professional learned societies." There should be a match between the response to precondition 8 and the unit's response to criterion 14.
11. Criteria 15 and 52.	Specific program outcomes. Criterion 15 asks for a similar list for the specialty studies component.
12. Criteria 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 28, and 52.	Expectations for candidates in professional studies.
13. Criteria 25, 28, and 52.	Expectations for candidates in clinical experiences.

14. Criteria 22, 23, 24, 27, and 31.	Assignment of candidates to clinical sites to ensure that a broad range of experiences are included in their programs.
15. Criteria 26, 30, and 32.	The roles and responsibilities of those participating in the practice settings.
16. Criteria 36, 38, 55, 64, and 72.	The "service" record of faculty in schools.
17. Precondition 10 and Criterion 39.	The affirmative action policy at the institution level and the unit level.
18. Precondition 5 and Criteria 41. and 43.	The admission policy and practice.
19. Criteria 46, 47, 48, and 49.	Advising candidates and providing them with specific sorts of information.
20. Criteria 33, 55, 62, and 64.	The "research" record of faculty.
21. Criteria 57 and 81.	The reliance of programs on adjuncts to teach in the regular programs.
22. Criteria 58 and 81.	The reliance on graduate candidates to teach in the regular programs.
23. Criteria 60, 61, and 77.	Faculty loads.
24. Criteria 83, 86, and 94.	Allocation of resources to programs.
25. Criteria 84, 90, 91, and 92.	Library holdings.
26. Criteria 84, 88, and 93.	Technology available to faculty and candidates.
27. Criteria 69, 70, and 71.	The decision-making policies and practices of the unit with respect to programs, selection of candidates, appointing faculty, and developing resources.

28. Criteria 85, 86, and 89.	Appropriate space.
29. Criteria 30, 32, and 63.	Preparing personnel for supervisory roles.
30. Criteria 63 and 80.	Faculty development.

II. Responses to Criteria Linked to Facts and Figures Submitted to the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System

Each year, members of AACTE submit an Annual Report to the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System. The purposes of the system are to help AACTE monitor trends in student enrollments, faculty hirings, and resources available to teacher education units. This appendix alerts AACTE members of the relevance of those figures to the preparation of the institutional report in general, and also specifically proposes areas of linkage. Please be cautious with the judgments entered into this table. There may be other criteria that are linked with the facts and figures submitted to the Joint Data Collection System.

NCATE Criteria	**Items in the AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection System**
Criterion 44	B-2
Criterion 40	B-5
Criterion 53	B-7
Criterion 81	B-8
Criteria 60, 61	B-9
Criteria 24, 56, 77, 79	B-10
Criteria 38, 55, 62, 64	B-11
Criterion 78	B-12
Criterion 82	B-13 a,b
Criterion 63	B-13 c,d
Criterion 84	B-14
Criterion 9	D-3

About the Author

James Raths has been actively involved in teacher education as a practitioner, as an administrator, and as a researcher for over thirty years. He participated in writing NCATE reports at five institutions during that time. In addition, he worked with a team of planners to develop the training program for those nominated to serve on the Board of Examiners. He prepared many of the narratives, work sheets, and video displays used in training sessions. He is currently chair of the Department of Educational Studies at the University of Delaware. He previously served as the dean of the College of Education and Social Services at Vermont and Associate Dean for Teacher Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He was a member of the Executive Board of the Holmes Group, serves on the Publications Committee of the Association of Teacher Educators, and continues to contribute to the teacher education literature through his writing.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle • Suite 610 • Washington, DC • 20036-1186
202/293-2450 • FAX 202/457-8095

BEST COPY AVAILABLE